

Preface to the translation of Dr. Stoeckhardt's "Roemerbrief".

The Concordia Cyclopædia describes Dr. George Stoeckhardt in this way: He "was an exegete of the first rank. Coupled with his great learning, his familiarity with the original languages, etc., and his logical mind was his firm belief in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and his childlike acceptance of all the teachings of Scripture, his great love of the revealed truth. He permitted nothing but the text to influence his thought. Concentrating all the powers of his believing heart and mind on the written Word, he obtained a wonderful grasp of the deep thoughts of the Spirit, and he had the rare gift of unfolding them in concise, clear, convincing language." - This is the man who has shown these qualities in his authorship of "Roemerbrief."

However, in translating from one language to another, there is always the difficulty of conveying certain idioms of the one into the other. This is especially true, when one works with the lengthy and involved sentence structure of the German language. Therefore, in reading this translation, it is hoped that one thought might be kept in mind: There was an effort to convey the thoughts of Dr. Stoeckhardt. This has caused some strange-sounding phrases and complicated sentences to be used, sentences that might not always pass the examination of the English grammarian. However, if this translation will bring some firm thoughts on the wonders of God's grace and mercy, of which the Letter to the Romans is all about in the first place, and will redound to the glory of God in the assuring of sinners of their justification by this grace of God thru faith alone - then this work will not have been in vain.

Soli Deo Gloria

The translator

25
2665.3
B 7613
1951

COMMENTARY ON ROMANS

translated by

The Rev. Edward W. Schade
(graduate, St. Louis, 1939)

from the original German of

COMMENTAR

ueber den

BRIEF PAULI AN DIE RÖMER

von

Dr. G. Stoeckhardt ✓ MUC

originally published by

Concordia Publishing House
1907

98095

Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Romans

By Dr. G. Stockhardt.

Preface.

The Letter to the Romans is confessedly the principle doctrinal writing in the New Testament. And therefore in an exposition of the same it is the chief purpose of the exegete to set forth the principle doctrinal teaching, certainly that is not possible without a genuine examination of the text & the context. The undersigned endeavored in the foregoing work to take into account first the grammatical side of the Letter, but, before everything else, the eternal, divine truths which have been expressed in this apostolic Epistle, in order to bring himself & the reader to the correct conviction. The truly historical interest, in which many late exegetes treat biblical books & especially the Letters of the Apostles, dare not lay claim to the name of any special scientific method. Every book must be judged by its own originality & by its own tendency. And what the tendency of the Holy Scriptures is shines forth of itself & is significantly expressed by Paul in 1 Tim. 3, 16.

The method used in this Commentary, running, closely-joined explanation & development, which is found, for example, in Hofmann, Hodel, & principally in Plügel, appeared to me to serve the above-named purpose of the exposition best of all. In the so-called glossary method (more by more), which binds itself to grammatical & factual ~~parts~~ remarks on the single constituent parts of the text, one loses the train of thought & the connection of the thoughts. On the other hand, when one treats the grammatical, lexicographic, historical, archaeological material in his remarks & confines the real exegetical exposition to a free reproduction of the contents of the Letter, as has happened in many of the latest commentaries, those things which are closely bound together, namely, language & circumstance, form & content, are torn asunder. The biblical text is here the greatest thing given & must therefore everywhere remain the central point of the matter under consideration. It is the business of the exposition to bring out the sense & content of the words which are there written. Therefore the exposition dare never hover over the text as an independent product of the mind. It is also our knowledge that no commentator has succeeded in separating completely the linguistic discussions out of the connecting development of thoughts. In this case the exegete must scrupulously weigh, how much of the linguistic material he will take into the exposition of the text, how much he will relegate to the notes. And the reader is obligated to continually look up and down.

Every new commentator on the Letter to the Romans must self-evidently take into consideration the former history of the exposition. In his Preface to his "Commentar zum Neuen

"*Testament*" Zahn has correctly called attention to the fact that no commentator offers room enough to discuss all the possible & impossible meanings together with their arguments, but that the present-day expositor should present to his readers all true matters worthy of note, which in the course of the centuries have been brought forth for the clarification of the biblical text. In the first volume of his work, in the exposition of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, he had observed moderation all too freely with the nominal quotation of ancient & modern exegetes of their opinion. In our commentary we have sought to make known all these interpretations, which alter the sense of an important passage & with that the doctrine of Paul, as misinterpretations; on the other hand, to permit the ancient & modern expositors to speak for themselves there where they have once presented & clarified the meaning of the Apostle in an especially conclusive manner. The fact that Luther has once again brought the Gospel of Paul into the field & opened up to Christianity the understanding of the central doctrine of justification, justifies the fact that we have made abundant use of the testimonies from the age of the Reformation, as it has otherwise happened in recent commentaries.

What has been said in the Introduction with regard to the literature on the Letter to the Romans, I might supplement here with a few words. The exposition of the Letter by Lipsius in the "*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*" was out of print at the appointment of the latter. "*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*" by the Rev. Wm. Sanday & the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, 11th Edition, 1906, came to my notice too late. In a perusal of the same I have run across no explanation of an important passage which is decisive for the teachings of Paul, which is not already found in earlier commentaries. The newest revision of the Letter to the Romans by H. Lietzmann and F. Niebergall in the "*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*", 1906, which in its brevity in other respects is also very deficient in its linguistic consideration, has come into my hand only after the completion of this work, after the printing had already been begun. The two authors named belong to the modern liberal tendency. They acknowledge that Paul had taught essentially as the Church of Christ has understood him from the beginning; they see in Paul the founder of ecclesiastical orthodoxy. They concede, for example, that Paul knew a pre-existent Christ, that he based justification, the forgiveness of sins on Christ's merit & sacrificial death. But now they seek to detach that which they admit as general religious & moral content of the doctrine of Paul, from the "*Heilstaten*" (salutary facts) & to cut it out of the "*mythologisches Rahmen*" (mythological framework). With such exegetes who deny every thing that is sacred & dear to a Christian, yes, who on opportunity bitterly ridicule these things, it is impossible to come to an understanding. These also with their so-called theology, with all their thinking & writing stand extra ecclesiam, & speak of Christian things as a blind man speaks about color.

May the study of the Letter to the Romans spur the Christian ~~reader~~ preachers on to walk in the footsteps of Paul, the great, divinely inspired preacher of the righteousness which avails before God!

G. Stockhardt.

Introduction.

1. The Author of the Letter.

That Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, has written the Letter which we have received as the Letter of Paul to the Romans is raised above all doubt. Weiss judges correctly: "The genuineness of our Letter is so decidedly confirmed by the testimony of the orthodox Church, as also by the *Smectici* Basilides, Valentinus, etc., & even by the judaizing heretics, who rejected the worth of the Apostle, there exists so completely no trace of a rejection of the Pauline authorship, that to call into question or to deny its authenticity the most compelling inner grounds must be displayed, by whose complete lack, however, the empty scruples of Erasmion & the outrages of B. Bauer can find no following. The Letter bears throughout the characteristic nature of the Epistle in content & form, is the principal source of his Gospel in its entire content & content, & thereby is also the richest original apostolic document & standard of all true, evangelical Protestantism." The objections of Bauer against the Pauline authorship of the last two chapters are likewise to be considered as obsolete & overcome. As far as it appears necessary, we shall come to an understanding with these in the exposition. The thoughtless hypotheses, which have recently been established concerning the formation of our Letter in the second century by such men as van Manen, Loman, Steck, Pierson, Smith of New Orleans, have been unmasked as such by one of the most radical German critics, Schmiedel of Zurich. Cf. *The Hibbert Journal*, 1903, pp. 532-52. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans is now almost generally acknowledged & accepted as such, even on the part of the most renowned defenders of the negatively critical school. And as an indubitably genuine apostolic Epistle, the Letter to the Romans is to us a part of the scriptures, given of God, which can make us wise unto salvation thru faith in Christ Jesus.

2. The Roman Congregation.

Concerning the formation of the Christian congregation in Rome, to which our Letter is directed, we have no definite report & knowledge. The Roman tradition, first recorded by Eusebius, according to which the Apostle Peter had come to Rome in the second year of the reign

of Emperor Claudias, ca. 42 A.D., was supposed to have been bishop there for 25 years in the congregation which he was supposed to have established, is decidedly erroneous, as is now generally admitted even on the part of Roman theologians. At the time of the Apostolic Council, Acts 15, ca. 50 A.D., we find Peter still in ~~Rome~~ Jerusalem. If Peter had been in Rome at the time when Paul wrote his Letter to the Romans, & he had been there as leader & elder of the congregation there, then Paul would certainly have mentioned him in his Letter, then, on the whole, Paul would never have written this Letter, he would not have previously determined so often to journey to Rome, since it was contrary to his practice to entrench upon the sphere of activity of another Apostle, to build on ground not his own. Rom. 15, 20; 1 Cor. 14, 16. But we know of no other founder of the Roman congregation. The first report of the existence of a Christian congregation in Rome is given us by the Letter to the Romans itself. Concerning the beginnings of Christianity in Rome we can offer conjectures, certainly very plausible conjectures. At the first Pentecost festival in Jerusalem there were also Jews & proselytes present according to Acts 2, 10, & it is very probable that some of these belonged to the 3000, who were converted by the preaching of Peter, & that these then brought the seed of the Gospel along back to Rome. The Christians of Jerusalem, who were "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," as it is reported in Acts 11, 19, traveled as far as Phenice & Cyprus & Antioch of Syria, & it is easily possible that some of them went as far as Rome, for there was connection by ship between the two lands mentioned & Italy. In the whole, in the active intercourse at that time between the synagogues in Rome & the Jews in Palestine nothing else is conceivable than that the report concerning Christ & the first Christian Church in Jerusalem & Judaea was also broadcast in Rome, so that Roman Jews on their business trips & pilgrimages came in contact with Christianity, even became Christians themselves, & converted Christians of Judaea came to Rome & settled there. The report of Suetonius, Claudias c. 25, & according to which Emperor Claudias Judaeos impulsore Chriato assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit, appears to point to the fact that thru the testimony of Christ among the Jews at Rome there arose tumults, which then had the edict of Claudias as a result, which certainly according to Dio Cassius, Hist. Rom., 60, 6, was soon withdrawn again. To those Jews driven out of Rome belonged also Aquila & Priscilla, who in Corinth were then won for Christ by Paul, Acts 18, 1ff., & returned to Rome as Christians. Rom. 16, 3. Similar experiences might have happened to other cities. Self-evidently the Christians in Rome had not kept silence concerning the hope that was in them. And as in Antioch the scattered Christians of Jerusalem proclaimed the Gospel also to the Gentiles, Acts 11, 20, so certainly also the Christians in Rome bore witness to the salvation in Christ not only to their fellow-countrymen but also to the Gentiles. When thereafter Paul had begun his missionary journey, after Christian con-

gregations had been established in the principal cities of Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, & Greece, there certainly, in the active intercourse between Rome & the provinces of the Roman Empire, many Gentile Christians of the Orient had come to Rome & there had taken care not only of their business activities, but also furthered the cause of Christ. Yes, the little group of Roman Christians must have grown rapidly; the word of Christ must have had good results in Rome. For the Letter of Paul to the Romans preannounces the formation of a considerable congregation, & certainly an organized congregation. Rom. 12, 4. Paul writes that the faith of the Romans is reported in the whole world. Rom. 1, 8. Meyer & Phillips thinks that one must differentiate between sporadic testimony of the laity & the official activity of teaching, & that the latter is the necessary supposition for the formation & organization of a Christian congregation. They therefore assume that a man with apostolic authority, an assistant of Paul, perhaps one of the fellow-laborers mentioned in Rom. 16, had been the real founder of the Roman congregation. However, that is an entirely unnecessary hypothesis, which rests upon perverted, romanticist ideas of the Church & the office. The Christians in Rome, according to the precedence & pattern of the Christian congregations of the Orient, could very well themselves, without the assistance

of an apostolic man, regulate & ordain their congregational life & establish teachers & elders. Some have further thought, & certainly in contradiction to Rom. 1, 8, that the Roman congregation must have ^{carried on} ~~continued~~ their existence for some time in quietness & hiding, because the leaders of the Jewish synagogue, whom Paul summoned to him after his arrival in Rome, had known nothing of their existence. But that is a false conclusion from Acts 28, 17 ff. There it is expressed reported that this sect, which was spoken against in all places, had been well known to the leaders of the Jews. They were lacking only the exact knowledge of the Christian doctrine, for which reason they questioned Paul concerning his teaching. And that explains itself sufficiently from the condition that the Christians in Rome, as also elsewhere, formed a communion separate & isolated from the world & from the Jewish synagogue, as also from the fact that the eminent Jews particularly ignored the despised sect of the Nazarenes. Likewise in our larger cities there are people enough, Jews & converts to Judaism, educated & uneducated, who know the Christian Churches & congregations of their neighborhood only by name & of the Christian doctrine they know as much as nothing.

The Roman congregation, to which Paul addressed his Letter, was, according to its formation, like all the Christian congregations outside of Palestine, made up of Jewish Christians & Gentile Christians. Only with regard to Jewish Christians could Paul in Rom. 4, 1 call Abraham τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν. In 15, 7 ff. he admonishes both sections, the Jews & the Gentiles within the congregation, to receive one another. "Even so to start with it is foreseen," says

Philippi, "that the number of the Gentile Christians was predominant; for this can be designated as the general, if not entirely the absolute condition of the Christian congregations in the heathen lands." Still this is now one of the much-discussed questions among the commentators, whether in Rome the Gentile Christians or the Jewish Christians formed the majority gave the congregation its character. Baur, of the Tuebingen school, in his time with regard to his entire comprehension of the Letter to the Romans with all his energy defended the view that the Roman congregation had been a predominantly Jewish Christian congregation, & he has found many followers, for example, Volkmar, Holsten, von Hengel, Reuss, Thierack, Holtzmann, & recently Zahn. This viewpoint, which a few decades ago reigned as the prevailing one, hangs together with the subjective observation of the respective commentators concerning the tendency of our Letter. The form & manner, as, for example, Zahn in his New Testament introduction refers to the principle thoughts of the Letter & their development in the Jewish Christian circle of readers, is the purest subjectivism. The proofs which some have taken from the various parties of the Letter are not sound. The teaching concerning the Law & the freedom from the Law, chap. 4, 8, fits, as the exposition will show, equally for the Gentile Christians as for the Jewish Christians. And the many Old Testament references & demonstrations of proof testify in no way for the predominance of Jewish Christianity in Rome, but explains itself fully in the fact that all Christian instruction in the apostolic age was carried out by means of the Old Testament, so that the demanded instruction of the Law & the prophets took place also among the Gentile Christians through reading in the assemblies. "Major Weiss. And so the balance has turned & the great number of the recent commentators see in the Roman congregation a predominantly Gentile Christian congregation. Thus, for example, Schott, Wieseler, Philippi, Hofmann, Meyer, Weiss, Godet, Outhardt, Weissacker, Pfleiderer. The following reasons are given. In the beginning of the Letter Paul establishes himself among his readers as the apostle to the Gentiles, who therefore have the right & the duty to teach them, to write to them. 1. 5-7, 13-15. To refer the expressions ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἐν οἷς, v. 1. 5, 6, to all the nations of the earth, as, for example, Zahn does, is an exegetical act of violence. Even so at the end of the Letter Paul points to his apostleship to the Gentiles, which had given him the courage to write to the Gentiles Romans as he had written. 15, 15, 16. And otherwise he addresses the readers of his Letter as ἑθνη, "Gentiles," 11, 3. He writes, 11, 25: Οὐ γὰρ ἔδει ὑμᾶς ἀγνωεῖν, ἀλλὰ ποιεῖν, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο. He would now impart a mystery to his brethren, to his Christian readers. And even these readers of his, his brethren, he reminds them in v. 30 of their heathenish past, that they had formerly been disobedient to God. There is to be considered further what Weiss brings into prominence: "After the apostolic Council, Gal. 2, 7 ff. it is to be supposed that Paul would not have written a doctrinal Letter to

the Romans, if the congregation in its entirety had been a congregation of *Ἰερατοῦ*, not of *Ἰσραήλ*. Deisschecker correctly calls attention to the following facts, that the Neronian persecution did not affect the Jews in Rome, which would have been the case, if the Christians had been regarded as a Jewish party; that the Letter of Clement to the Romans, written about 30 years later, breathes completely the Gentile Christian spirit; that in the Roman catacombs, in the burial places of the ancient Christians, in every moment one comes upon names, which belonged to eminent families of the city of Rome. Accordingly one certainly does not err, when one takes for granted that the Gospel of Christ, first of all took root among the Jews, but then, especially when the eminent Jews had turned from it, as well as after the arrival of oriental Gentile Christians, it found ready acceptance among the Gentiles, so that the congregation to which Paul wrote his Letter to the Romans was a genuinely Roman congregation, even tho a considerable number of Jews were intermingled in it.

3. The Place and Time of the Writing of the Letter.

Both of these facts can be determined exactly. According to Rom. 16, 2 Paul commended to the Roman Christians the dearness Phoebe of Kenchrea, who evidently was the bearer of this Letter. Kenchrea was the seaport town of Corinth. In his Letter, 16, 2, 3, the Apostle sends a greeting from his host, Gaius. According to 1 Cor. 1, 14 he was a member of the Corinthian congregation. Therefore without a doubt the Letter was written from Corinth, & from there sent to Rome. The Acts of the Apostles reports a double stay of Paul in Corinth. According to Acts 18, 1, on his second missionary journey he came to Corinth from Athens, there spent a year & six months, & in this city won a great number of people for the Lord. At that time he had begun his work in the land of Greece & did not consider it further. On his third missionary journey, according to Acts 20, 2, 3, he remained in Greece for three months, & certainly for the greater time in the principal city of Greece, where the principal congregation of the land was found, in Corinth. From Greece, as it is further reported in Acts 20, he then returned to Asia, in order to be in Jerusalem, if possible, on Pentecost. At this time already the eyes of the Apostle were turned to Rome as the goal of his journey. Already in Ephesus, according to Acts 19, 21, from where he had set out for Macedonia & Greece, he had proposed to journey to Jerusalem thro Macedonia & Greece, & then also to visit Rome. With this time & with these circumstances that agree exactly with what we read in Rom. 15, 24 ff. There Paul attests to the Romans that he considered coming to Rome & then travelling from Rome to Spain, but that first he would deliver a collection of the Christians in Macedonia & Greece to Jerusalem. Accordingly, Asia also generally accepted, he wrote this Letter of his to the Romans during his second stay in Corinth, in the year 53 or 54 A.D.

4. The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter.

A considerable number of commentators hold that the Letter to the Romans, the same as most of the Pauline Epistles, was occasioned by circumstances & needs of the congregation to which it was addressed, & hereby decide the tendency of the Letter. In the designation of the special occasion & purpose of our Letter, however, the opinions are, as a rule, three. They have ascribed to the Letter to the Romans, first of all an apostolic-political tendency, & certainly an anti-Judaistic tendency. The first renowned supporters of this view were Bauer. He sees in the Roman congregation not only an essentially Jewish-Christian but a Jewish-minded & confirmed congregation & in the Letter of Paul to the Romans an attack on the Jewish standpoint of the Roman Christians & a defence of the anti-Judaistic, free from the Jew standpoint of the Epistle. He takes chap. 9-11 as the real heart of the Letter, to which the first eight chapters serve only as an introduction. As the "external occasion" for this principle part of the Letter & with that for the entire Letter "can be considered nothing else," so he writes in his "Paulus," I, 353, — "even as this, which forms the direct contrast to the idea carried out by the Epistle in this section, thus the objection which could still be raised against the participation of the Gentiles in the grace of the Gospel, or against the Pauline universionism in the latter connection, the religious thought so deeply rooted in the knowledge of the Jews & Jewish Christians that, so long as Israel did not share in this grace as a nation, as the people chosen by God, the participation of the Gentiles in it appears as a retrenchment of the Jews, as an injustice against them, as a disagreement with the promises given by God to the Jews as the people of God. The principle thought which lies at the base of this error, the object about which both sides deal, is the theocratic primacy of the Jewish nation, the absolute preference which they formerly claimed to have over all nations & which they now saw disappearing irrevocably thru the Pauline universionism." "The basic idea permeating both principle parts is the absolute futility of all claims which were asserted by Jewish particularism. The purpose of the Epistle is to refute the Jewish particularism so principally & radically, so that it lies completely eradicated before the knowledge of the time, & these ideas we see carried out in the Letter to the Romans so much more clearly & completely, the closer the connection is in which the two parts touch one another." P. 350. The interpretation of Bauer has found much agreement & has been adopted with many modifications, for example, by Schwegler, Schenkel, Holtzmann, Reuss, Thierack, & Mangoldt. Zahn reduces the anti-Judaism attacked by Paul to "Vorurtheile" (prejudices) of the Roman Jewish Christians against the Gospel of Paul. The formation & character of the Roman congregation, as Paul was acquainted with it from the reports of his friends from there, made it appear necessary for him to come to an understanding with them by a

complete presentation of that which signified the Gospel to him, thereby to dispense the prejudices, which were brought against him & the carrying on of his mission on the part of the Jewish born Christians & also to prevent future dangers. By virtue of their Jewish origin, their connection with the Church of Palestine, & their place of habitation in the center of world commerce, the Roman congregation could just as well become a source of the Judaistic mission, which had followed the apostle on foot everywhere, as a support for the mission work in the west, as he meant it." Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 308. The Judaizing agitators, who according to Zahn were making an approach at that time, were acknowledged within the Roman congregation, which according to his ideas was essentially a Gentile Christian congregation, already in full activity when Paul wrote his letter. In his work "Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche," 1902, p. 424 ff., he expresses himself in the following manner: "The letter to the Romans is a polemic treatise not only against Judaistic doctrine, but without doubt also against Judaizing activity." "The entire doctrinal section of his letter is full of anti-Judaistic polemics; it is here more completely more rounded out than anywhere, even in the letter to the Galatians." "The two facts, that the congregation was Gentile Christian & that of itself it was not Judaistic, on the one hand, & that Paul had to refute Judaism for them, on the other hand, demand the assumption that Judaistic teachers were on the point of taking possession of it & that Paul had received a report of this."

We can never agree with the here-presented explanation of the genesis of the letter to the Romans. The anti-Judaistic tendency of the same together with its hypothesis, the Judaistic, particular inclination of the Jewish Christians in Rome, or the threat of the Roman congregation by Judaistic teachers is an invention of the respective commentators; it has no support in the text of the letter nor in any other of the New Testament writings. The letter to the Romans is, in distinction from the others, a really a polemic, Pauline Epistle, as is very well generally acknowledged, written in serene, measured tones. Other congregations, like those of Galatia & Corinth, it is true, had been threatened by Judaizing teachers or were already perverted. These false teachers & apostles, however, are also named & characterized in the letter to the Galatians & in the second letter to the Corinthians. In our letter there is found no reference to such opponents of the apostle & the apostolic activity and it is not Paul's way to attack his opponents indirectly or, as it were, from behind. The warning against false teachers in Rom. 16: 17-23 is considered so general that it applies to the Christians of all places & of all times. And this warning added on to the close of the letter certainly does not give the character to the entire letter. We discover in the letter no trace which points to the fact that the Jewish Christians in Rome had opposed the Gospel which was proclaimed by Paul & which

was acknowledged by their Gentile fellow Christians, that they had been implicated in Jewish ideas. In his Epistle to the Romans Paul had intended refutation of the above-mentioned prejudices & objections of the Jewish born Christians, them, as, for example, Godet correctly calls attention to the fact, the display of means, for example, the long doctrinal discussions, would stand in no relation to this purpose. Certainly in his Letter Paul often permits a contrary meaning to be expressed in words, mostly in the form of a question. Still the dialectic questions, by which Paul carries on his discussion, as in 6, 1, 15; 7, 2, and completely in 9, 14, 19; 10, 4; 11, 1, 14, belong so completely to the peculiar movement of thought of the Epistle, which is otherwise known to us, that it is entirely arbitrary to see in them objections of the opponents whom he is attacking. Weiss. Certainly at Paul's time & also in Rome there had been people who had made the reproach against the Christian doctrine, especially the doctrine of the free grace of God, that this led to or gave occasion for sin. Cf. 3, 2; 6, 1. But those were in general opponents of Christianity, as even today we hear similar evil slanders from the mouths of unbelievers. Certainly, in his Letter to the Romans, in that he there presented his Gospel, the Apostle stood completely in opposition to the opposing errors. He everywhere added to his thesis, the principal Thesis, that man is justified by faith, the antithesis represented by the unbelieving Jews, which he excluded: not by work, not by the works of the Law. But there applies here what Meyer remarks: "Naturally Paul could not in general present his Gospel in any other way than in opposition to the Jewish work-righteousness & arrogance, which it had overcome & would overcome continually; for this opposition belonged to its essence, & it had to put itself forward everywhere, wherever Judaism was; even at Rome." Wherever the Christian truth is heard, there opposition & error also raise themselves up, & therefore confession of the truth is impossible, inconceivable without the exclusion of error, & so it belongs to the essence of Christian doctrine & the presentation of doctrine, that this lays bare & refutes the opposing errors. The principle article of Christian doctrine, concerning justification by faith, concerning the righteousness which avails before God, one can present & clarify in no other way than in contrast to the Jewish Pharisaical self-righteousness & work-righteousness. Thus already the prophets of the Old Testament, when they reminded their people of the great favors of God or prophesied to them of the future grace, continually impressed upon them the fact that God was gracious to them for His own sake, not for their sake, not for the sake of their works. Christ, when He entered upon His teaching activity, found a Judaism made corrupt, legally perverted by the Pharisees & scribes, and therefore, in that He attested Himself as the promised Redeemer, as the Savior of sinners, He had to put to shame the self-confidence of the Jews. And in a similar situation the Apostles of Jesus. Christ found themselves, yea, even today all Christian preachers find themselves there. For the

Pharisaic-Judaistic doctrine of works is not only the keystone also of present-day Judaism, but has also taken root in the Roman Church, in other sects, yea, in basically the morals & religion of the entire unbelieving world, of natural, unconverted mankind. The attack of anti-evangelical errors, which is necessarily combined with the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ, is, however, an entirely different thing than what these commentators understand under anti-Judaistic polemic. Only the former, not the latter is a characteristicum also of the Letter to the Romans.

While to the one the Letter to the Romans appears as a controversial writing, other commentators have received from it the opposite impression, namely, that it pursues an ironic, conciliatory tendency. Hilgenfeldt thinks that thru the inner divisions of both parts of the Jewish-Christian & Gentile-Christian sections of the Roman congregation, this document had been occasioned, in which Paul would reconcile the patrician consciousness of Jewish Christianity with the surprisingly spread & strengthened common people of Gentile Christianity, in that he sought to completely remove the aversion of the Jewish Christians against the Law-free Gospel." Einleitung, p. 310. Volkmar & Nolten judge similarly. In his book, "Das Christenthum, seine

Schriften und Lehren, 1902, I, p. 149 ff.; 309 ff. Pfleiderer follows out the idea, that the Apostle in his Letter seeks to win for his Gospel the Jewish minority, which felt itself pressed & infringed upon, & to reconcile them with the Gentile Christianity, which was gaining ground victoriously; on the other hand, to procure for the Gentile Christians a deeper insight into the moral essence of Christianity; therefore in this document he appeased the scruples of the Roman Jewish Christians against his doctrine of justification by faith & freedom from the Law & clarified for them the fact of the Gentile Christianity's becoming superior as a divine dispensation, which did not stand in opposition to the divine promise to Israel. He gives us the most exact information regarding how it stood with the Christians in Rome at the time of the composition of the Letter. He reports, as if he had read these things in the Roman annals, that at that time two separate Christian congregations existed in Rome, the Gentile Christian original congregation & a smaller congregation, made up of Christians who had immigrated from Palestine, whose leader was Aquila, & that the former showed no willingness to receive the latter into their midst. Thru the conflict between these two congregations, as he thinks, Paul was moved to direct this document to

the original Roman congregation, in which he carried out the purpose of opposing the consequences which the separate congregation of Palestine would have for the original congregation & removing the separation existing between them.

That the last sketched construction of the Letter to the Romans is a vision is apparent. But what concerns the entire theory concerning the conciliatory tendency of the same, were great what

we have already remarked above, that in general the contrast between the Jewish Christians & the Gentile Christians in Rome belongs to the field of fiction. And therefore there was no need for an attempt at reconciliation on the part of the Apostle, which one can exact from the text of this Letter only with force. According to the Letter to the Romans the Roman congregation appears as a unified congregation, which was one in faith, which certainly still adhered to many defects, for example, also in the point of brotherly love. The contrast which actually goes through the entire Letter is the contrast between the believing Jews & Gentiles on the one hand & the unbelieving Jewish people on the other hand, between justification by faith & justification by works, & that is an irreconcilable contrast which Paul also in no manner seeks to equalize. The many references to the Old Testament promises in our Letter explain themselves, as already mentioned above, sufficiently from the essence of the apostolic teaching, except that one needs to take into help the forced hypothesis, that in this manner Paul had wanted to win the Roman Jewish Christians for his Gospel. The apostolic doctrine, the Gospel of Paul was & is no new doctrine & religion, but the original faith, which had already been attested by Moses & the prophets. The Gospel shows & is the fulfillment of the Old Testament promise. The Old Testament has value & is an authority for the Church of all times, which shall be gathered out of all the nations of the earth. Therefore the Apostles, after the example of Christ have based their teaching & preaching completely on the Old Testament scriptures, no matter whether they had to deal with Jews or with Gentiles, & had acquainted the Gentile Christians also with the writings of the prophets. The Church of Christ, likewise also the Gentile Church, is built upon the foundation of the Apostles & Prophets.

An *unicum* is the explanation of Spitta concerning the genesis of our Letter in his work, "zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristenthums. III. 1. Hälfte: Untersuchungen über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer." 1901. As Otto splits the Roman congregation, so Spitta splits the Letter to the Romans into two parts. About the time of the Apostolic Council Paul had given a justification of his Gentile mission work in a letter to the Jewish Christians, even as he had presented it before the "Geltenden" in Jerusalem. For the Jewish Christians looked at the preaching of the free grace & the surprising growth of the Gentile Church doubtfully & uncertainly, & Paul sought to prevent these scruples. According to Spitta this portion of the writing is contained in Rom. 1, 16b-11, 10. Here Jewish Christian readers are presumed everywhere with the exception of a few passages; the framework, however, which surrounds these expressions, 1, 1-15; 11, 11-36; 15, 14-33, designate the readers expressly as Gentile Christians. Into this framework Paul had later enclosed this letter, in order to send it in this form to the expressly Gentile Christian congregation in Rome & in this manner to make it suitable for the Gentile circle of readers. That then had been the first letter of Paul to the Romans, after which, about the years 63 or 64, a second followed.

from which Rom. 12-15, 2; 16, 1-20 was preserved. Finally some unknown person worked the two portions of the letters into one letter. For Spitta's understanding of chap. 9-11 is of deciding significance. Here he differentiates between 9, 1-11, 10 and 11, 11-36. Between both sections there exists such a deep contrast that it is for him psychologically impossible that the author of 11, 11 ff. should have written 9, 1-11, 10 at the same time. For from 11, 11 on the thought is presented that finally all Israel shall be saved, while according to 9, 1-11, 10 only a part of Israel is elected; Israel as a whole, however, *Ἰσραὴλ ὅλος* (11, 10) remains obdurate. Thus in the time from the Apostolic Council to the writing of the first letter to the Romans there had entered into Paul a change in his perception concerning the destiny of Israel & in his state of mind over against his people. That the two-fold statement concerning Israel in chap. 9-11 do not contradict one another will be shown in the exposition. Moreover, the historical data, with which Spitta operates, as for example the letter of Paul to the Jewish Christians from the time of the Apostolic Council, is taken all together out of the air. And an authority of that sort as is here ascribed to the Apostle Paul, who with his altered meaning should at the same time have asserted the former, contrary meaning.

It would not only be an unicum, but a monstrum. Still the modern critics in their literary profession have accustomed themselves to such monstra. The best critique of the modern mock critics is contained in Karl Heesdam's book: "Der Römerbrief bewahrt und gerichtet." 1891. 4p. "Lehre und Wehre," 1892, p. 87 ff.

The most recent literary product, which is dedicated to the problem of the Letter to the Romans & from which we have partially taken the cited material on the history of literature, is Heine's book, "Der Römerbrief, Eine exegetische Studie." 1903. Heine turns the tables & maintains that the execution of this Letter does not aim, as the previously named expositors believe, at the overcoming, refuting, or winning of the Jewish Christians, but much rather at the instruction of the Gentile Christians. He, like Baur & Spitta, finds the basic motive of the Epistle expressed "most clearly" in chap. 9-11, except that in these chapters the opposite to that which the former have found therein comes out so clearly. He writes: "Accordingly the basic thought of the Epistle is this: To show God's way with the Gospel that this salvation is intended for the whole world. Israel alone is & remains God's holy people. Their blessings are the ones in which the rest of mankind receives a share. Therefore the Roman Gentile Christians have no reason to look down disdainfully upon the Jewish nation, even tho' the majority of them have remained unbelieving. The Gentile Christians should thankfully praise the way of God, which had ordained unbelief over Israel so long, until the fulness of the Gentiles had been won for the Christian faith. But Paul spoke of this as the Apostle to the Gentiles, borne by his conviction

of the truth of his Law-free evangelical proclamation, & acknowledging the Christianity of the Romans, which also would know nothing regarding a tie to the Jewish Law, completely as fully qualified. With this is given the key to the understanding of the Letter to the Romans: The Letter would show that salvation is completely universal, that only the preaching of the Gospel is justified, which overcomes the limitations of Jewish particularism & places the redemptive death of Christ as the only foundation of salvation, but not without standing that the Gospel is the fulfillment of the Old Testament promise, which had been presented to the nation of Israel, & this people possessed an inalienable privilege & superiority, which the Gentile Christians could not fail to recognize: P. 52. Therefore Heine gives the chapter, which presents the one solution to the problem, the following superscription: "Der Römerbrief als Darstellung des heidenchristlichen und doch jüdenchristlichen Evangeliums des Paulus für die das ungeläubige Israel hochmütig bewertenden heidenchristlichen Römer." P. 53. Yes, in this manner one can easily carry every outrageous motive thru the Letter. The solution of Heine, which completely indiscreetly makes the special warning to the Gentile Christians in 11, 16 ff. into the theme of the entire Letter, will show itself also as an "Eintagsfliege" (ephemeral or day fly), & like that of Baur concerning the interpretation as an historical document shall be placed ad acta.

Now if there were not special conditions & necessities of the Roman congregation, with which the Letter to the Romans deals, whose formation, content, & purpose find a sufficient explanation, then perhaps the personal circumstances & needs of Paul could have occasioned the Letter & have moved the Apostle to write exactly as he had written. That is the opinion of Hofmann. & the exegesis dependent on him. Hofmann here ascribes to the Apostle the opinion, to refute the appearance aroused by the Apostle's former avoidance of Rome, as if he bore an aversion against proclaiming the Christian message of salvation in the world capital in the center of heathen education & culture. How? The complete presentation of doctrine contained in the Letter is supposed to be only a means to this end? No, the personal remarks of Paul at the beginning & close of the Letter are apparently only the framework of the instruction which makes up the real content of the Letter. Hofmann finally makes the following concessions: "The congregation, in that the Apostle appeared not to teach them originally, but appeared only to want to assert his boundless joy for the preaching of the doctrine of Christ, had been imperceptibly taught & enriched by him, that they willingly permitted everything to be said to them that he had to say to them." But how? Did the rich instruction, which the Roman congregation had received from him in this Letter, flow from the pen of the Apostle imperceptibly, so much by chance? Schott is of the opinion that Paul actively up to the writing of the Letter to the Romans had been principally Jewish mission work,

but now, since he was on the point of beginning his mission work among the Gentiles in the far west, he had wanted to win a *firm fulcrum* in the Roman congregation for this new activity of his, & therefore in this Epistle of his he had wanted to instruct the Romans concerning the significance & right of his step & completely show forth to them the nature & the principles of his work. But everything that we read in the Acts of the Apostles & the Letters of Paul concerning the activity of Paul contradicts this view, as if Paul had worked among the Jews above all in the Orient & had begun his real mission work among the Gentiles first with his removal to the west. And the entire arrangement & content of the Letter to the Romans contradicts the taking of this Letter as a personal justification of the activity of Paul. And so is the tendency forced upon our Letter, which Luther attributes to the Apostle, that thru the presentation of the world-destination & world-significance of Christianity he would move the Romans to his apostolic mission.

The previously mentioned commentators cannot free themselves from the thought that an entirely special occasion & tendency must lie at the basis of the Letter to the Romans, as of the other Pauline Epistles, & because that is difficult to discover, therefore they speak of a problem of the Letter to the Romans & have sought to solve it in every possible way. Heine, who after the many vain attempts of his predecessors thinks he has found one correct solution to the puzzle, remarks at the same time very naively, but very correctly that "the Letter to the Romans has always again & again given the impression that in a certain sense it is a collective presentation of the Pauline Gospel." H. a. 3. p. 23. Now, why do they not give room to this impression? Why do they not renounce the discovery of always new hypotheses, which move about on X, which they shall never decipher, because it does not exist? All "such special designations of purpose," as Meyer correctly remarks, "are missing from the Letter in the information of concrete conditions." Yes, it is true, the Letter has always again, at all times given the impression to commentators that Paul had given & self-evidently also aimed at a complete presentation of his doctrine in the same. The old Greek commentators, Origen, Chrysostom, & Theodoret, those of the Middle Ages, as Johannes Damascenus, Sekumenius, Theophylact, seek in our Letter no purpose, full of mystery other than this: to lead men to Christ. *Model.* In the old Protestant Church the Letter to the Romans was regarded completely as a sort of *Compendium doctrinae christianae*, as the "Loci" of Melancthon, the first evangelical dogmatics, have grown out of it. And with that agree essentially most of the modern exegetes. Olshausen writes: "One can therefore say that in the Letter to the Romans there is contained at the same time a Pauline dogmatics, in that all the instances, which the Apostle Paul was accustomed to call attention to in preference.

in his handling of the Gospel, are here completely developed. Bodet: "We possess in this Letter nothing more simple than the course of religious instruction, as it were, the dogmatic & moral catechism of the Epistle." Similarly judge Tholuck, Rueckert, de Wette, Fritzsch, Meyers, Weiss, Philippi & others.

The didactic purpose of the Letter meets us sufficiently enough from the Letter itself, as also the occasion of the instruction, which lies in nothing else than in the office of Paul as the teacher & Apostle of the Gentiles. The Apostle had already often intended to come to Rome, in order to strengthen the Roman congregation, to impart to them some spiritual gift, but had, formerly been hindered in that purpose. Rom. 1, 11. 13. When he wrote this Letter, he had decidedly resolved to travel thru Rome to Spain, but first he had to go to Jerusalem to minister to the saints. Rom. 15, 24, 25, 27; Acts 19, 21. On the way to Jerusalem & in Jerusalem a new hindrance could easily step into the way of the project of his Roman journey. Thus the oral communication with the Roman Christians still stood in the undetermined future. But in Corinth there was found a welcome opportunity to send a letter to the Romans, in that the deaconess Phoebe was on the point of going to Rome. Under these circumstances what was more natural, yea, more self-evident than that the Apostle seized this opportunity & to the Roman congregation, which was predominantly Gentile Christians, & which had begun without his assistance & had grown rapidly, he imparted by letter that which he had spoken orally to the other congregations among the Gentiles, at a time when he could not in the very near future speak & deal with them mouth to mouth? He was a debtor to the Greeks as well as to the barbarians. 1, 14. He had received the special commission from the Lord to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, to establish the obedience of faith among the Gentiles. 1, 5; 15, 16. For, because of this special Gentile apostleship of his, because of this special grace which had been granted him, ἵνα τῶν ἁπλῶν τῶν Σαβείων πολὺ ὦν τῶν ἑθνῶν, he had, as he himself testifies in 15, 15, written this Letter to the Romans, ἵνα ἐμνημόνησεν ὑμᾶς, in order to remind them of that which they had already heard & learned from others, of the Christian doctrine, to present & to establish this doctrine among them completely. In this epistle he would evidently give to the Romans a substitute for his oral teaching & preaching, with which they had formerly done without & would still have to do without for a long time in the future. And now one also takes in addition the following facts, to which Bodet also calls attention. Before Paul came to Rome he had been active a long time at Ephesus. There for two years he had instructed the Christians regularly in the school of the orator Tyrannus, had held associated discourses. Acts 19, 9, 10. He had proclaimed to the Ephesians the whole counsel of God. Acts 20, 27. Then he had traveled thru Macedonia & there had admonished the disciples with many words, διὰ πολλὰ ῥημάτων. And now he did the same also in the land of Greece, especially in Corinth, Acts 20, 1-3. The official activity of Paul

during his third missionary journey consisted primarily in exhaustive instructions & admonitions of the disciples, whom he had won for the Lord on his second missionary journey. How close it lay to him, therefore, to convey to the principal Christian congregation in the world capital, which everywhere made many speak of it, a written instruction, which contained the entire counsel of God concerning our salvation, since he could not first of all instruct them. Certainly the origin & tendency of the Letter to the Romans is transparent enough, when one rightly takes into consideration the notes properly contained here in the Letter itself & in the Acts of the Apostles. One does not need to write anything in addition, likewise not, that the Apostle, as Weiss supposes, at the important turning-point at which he had now arrived, when he would transfer his Gentile missionary activity from the Orient to the west, felt in himself the need of bringing to his own conviction the collective spiritual products of the last years & to establish them by means of a literary presentation, & that he sent this document to the Roman congregation because his clear vision recognized the fact that the church in the world capital must become the center of the great Gentile Church.

One thing among all that one dare never forget, namely, that Paul had received his doctrine, his Gospel, from the Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. 15, 3, and that the Holy Spirit had taught Paul & his fellow Apostles the heavenly, divine wisdom which they spoke both orally & in writing & also taught them the words with which they expounded the wisdom of God. 1 Cor. 2, 7, 12, 13. And the Spirit of God, who has also spoken thru Paul in the foregoing Letter, & has given him the impulse to write, hereby had still a further intention, namely this, that in this Epistle, which Luther correctly names as the principal article of the New Testament, He would place into the hands of the Church of God of all ages a firm & certain form of the saving doctrine, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\chi\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, which should form the basis of all Christian instruction, also of the learned instruction, which satisfies the needs, the needs of salvation of all ages, which repulses the most corrupt errors of all ages.

Finally, when one has objected that in this "doctrinal system" of the Apostle the essential chief articles of the Christian doctrine are not alluded to, for example, Christology & eschatology, then a fleeting glance at the content of the Letter shows the opposite. Certainly, the way of salvation ordained by God is presented here above all. But neither does it lack in the basic

teaching of the Person of the Savior. The statement of Rom. 9, 5 is one of the most eminent redemptive doctrinal of the article of the true divinity of Christ. In the presentation of the work of redemption Christ is designated expressly as the Son of God. In the introduction of the Letter there are found the stamina of biblical Christology. And likewise in the Letter there is a continual pointing to the end of the way of salvation, to the day of judgment, to the deliverance

from the impending wrath, to the resurrection of the dead, to the future glory & the life eternal.

5. Content & Disposition of the Letter.

In the foregoing section, in the discussion of the occasion & tendency of the Letter, we naturally had to reflect already on its content. The Letter to the Romans, as we have attested, as every impartial reader soon becomes aware, is a comprehensive, associated presentation of the doctrine of Paul, of the Christian doctrine, which also has no other purpose than to instruct the readers of the Letter, to advance & to establish them in the knowledge of the divine truths. Here we give only a short review of the doctrinal content of the Letter. A deep insight into the structure of the content, into the train of thought of the Apostle one can give only then, when one takes up the Letter itself & gives a commentary on it. After the introductory remarks in 1, 1-15 the Apostle announces the theme, 1, 16-17, which he then works out in five parts. In one word the theme is the righteousness revealed in the Gospel, the righteousness which avails before God & leads to salvation, the righteousness of faith. Knowledge of righteousness presupposes a knowledge of sin. And so in the first section, 1, 18-3, 20, the Apostle first of all shows that all men, Gentiles & Jews, are under sin, are guilty & punishable before God. Then in the second part, 3, 21-5, 21, he describes the nearness of that righteousness & shows that man is justified before God without the works of the Law, by grace alone, thru the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, thru faith in Christ. The third part, chap. 6-8, treats of sanctification, the walking in the Spirit, as the necessary effect of the justification by faith. The fourth part, chap. 9-11, is of historical content. Paul points to the wonderful way in which God leads Israel & the Gentiles, & which ends on this, that not only the fulness of the Gentiles, but also the full number of Israel shall actually become partakers of the salvation in Christ. In the fifth part, chap. 12-16, there still follow special admonitions to the Christians, who are motivated by the mercy of God. Here the individual characteristics of the Christian life & conduct are brought forth.

We supplement this designation of content with a few statements from the Preface of Hoerner's "Commentarius in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos scriptam": Nihil certe omnino ratio et mens hominis de illis habet cognita, quae sola Dei gratia et benigna revelatione nobis communicari solent. Quenam illae? Quomodo nimirum a peccatorum mole et damnatione liberemur, iusti reputemur a Deo, et restituiamur pristinae integritati et sanctitati, in qua primos parentis conditor esse et ex illa postea excidisse secumque totum humanum genus et omnem suam posteritatem in tristissimam ruinam epitumque traxisse nemini non ex ecclesiae doctrina constat. Haec autem a nullo sacro

scriptore rectius, plenius majoraque cum spiritu et fructu perscripta et ecclesiae sunt tradita relictaque, quam a D. Paulo, cum in plurimis eius epistolis aliis, tum vero in hac potissimum, quam ad Romanos, doctor homines et ad christianam fidem conversos ipse vixit scripsit atque misit. ... In hac nostra (epistola) hoc agit potissimum et exprobrat, ut locum de gratuita per fidem justificatione hominis peccatoris fidei studio perspicue et clare doceat et illi vicinos locos de peccato, de gratia, de lege conjungat, neque in nostris et miseriae nostrae cognitionem ducat et Dei Patris admirandam bonitatem et misericordiam in nobis propter Christum justificandi mirifice commendat. Quid enim docet aliud, quam omnes homines esse peccatores et sola fide aut gratia, Dei misericordia propter Christum satisfactionem et obedientiam justificari, et justos debere pietati et caritati studere? Ob quarum rerum praestantem dignitatem, licet illa non quaedam alias esset scripta: primus tamen ei locus iudicio ecclesiae inter omnes epistolas Pauli datus et concessus, fuit, ut rei hoc quoque nomine esset nobis commendabilior et gratior. Sed ab his ut quoque rerum sententiarumque miram arantatem et verborum lucem tamque perclarum et expectatum ordinem cum praecipuorum membrorum, tum etiam minorum partium, ut distincte et accurate eam legentem non posset non valde officere neque jucunda et perspicua videri.

Finally there are added here, from the classical preface of Luther to the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, A. L. Ed., II, p. 74 ff., the beginning of the conclusion, as well as the short summaries to every individual chapter:

"This Epistle is the real chief article of the New Testament, & the most undispensed Gospel, which is really worthy & worthwhile, that a Christian should not only commit it to memory word for word, but associate with it daily, as with daily bread for the soul. For it can never be read or studied too much or too well, & the more it is dealt with, the more precious does it become & the more enjoyed.

"Because it is given to an evangelical preacher, first of all, to smite all through the revelation of the Law of sin & to make into sin what is not motivated by the faith of Christ, whereby men shall be led to their own knowledge & misery, so that they become humble & desire.

Thelg, so did St. Paul also, & he begins in the very first chapter & criticizes the gross sins & the unbelief which were manifest as the sins of the heathen were & still are, who live without God, & says: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness & unrighteousness of men." For altho they at the same time know & daily recognize that there is a God, still the nature in them itself, outside of grace, is so evil that it neither gives thanks to Him nor

nor honors him, but blinds itself & continually falls into worse conduct, until after idolatry it also works the most shameful sins with all blasphemies, unashamed & unpunished.

"In the second chapter he extends such punishment further upon those who outwardly appear so devout, or who sin secretly, as the Jews were & as all hypocrites still are, who without lust & love have well (honorably), & in the heart are hostile to God's Law, & still they gladly judge other people, as is the manner of all hypocrites, that they consider themselves pure, & still are full of avarice, hatred, & pride, & hide all filthiness, Matt. 23:25. They are those who despise the goodness of God & according to their hardness heap upon themselves the wrath, so that St. Paul, as a genuine expounder of the Law, permits no one to remain without sin, but proclaims the wrath of God to all, who by nature or a free will would live well, & permits them to be nothing better than the manifest sinners; yea, he says, they are hard-hearted & unrepentant.

"In the third (chapter) he casts them all into one heap & says: One is as the other, all are sinners before God, except that the Jews had God's Word; altho many have not believed on that, still God's grace & mercy are not thereby at an end. And he casually inserts the statement from the 51. Psalm, v. 6, that God remains righteous in his words. After that he again comes to the point & proves also by the scripture that they are all sinners, & thru the work of the Law no one is justified, but that the Law had been given only to give a knowledge of sin. Therefore he begins & teaches the correct way, how one must become devout & saved & says: 'All have sinned & come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace thru faith in Christ, who has merited such things for us thru his blood, & thus become a throne of grace for us before God, who forgives us all former sins; thereby he proves that his righteousness alone, which he gives thru faith, helps us, which at the same time is manifest thru the Gospel, & has formerly been testified thru the Law & the Prophets. Thus the Law is established thru faith, altho the works of the Law are laid down together with their glory.

"In the fourth (chapter), when now thru the first three chapters sin is revealed & the way of faith to righteousness is taught, he begins to encounter several objections & claims, & takes up the first one, which all generally do, who hear of faith, how he is justified without works, & say: Should one then do no good works? Thus he holds Abraham up before himself & says: What has Abraham then done with his works? Has it all been in vain? Were his works unnecessary? And he concludes that Abraham had been justified without any works, but alone thru faith, so that even before the work of his circumcision he is praised as justified by the scriptures only because of his faith, Gen. 15, 6.

But had the work of circumcision done nothing for his righteousness, which God had demanded, & was a good work of obedience, so certainly no other good work can do anything for righteousness, but, as the circumcision of Abraham was an outward sign whereby he proved his righteousness in faith, so are all good works only signs, which follow out of faith & prove, as the good fruits, that the man is already inwardly righteous before God. With that, as with a powerful example from the scriptures, St. Paul now corroborates his former teaching in the third chapter, v. 27, concerning faith, & adds to that still another witness, David, from the 32. Psalm, which also states that man is justified without works; altho he does not remain without works, when he has become justified. Afterwards he broadens out the example against all other works of the Law, & concludes that the Jews might not be heirs of Abraham because of blood, much less because of the works of the Law, but they must honor Abraham's faith, if they would be real heirs, since Abraham had been justified by faith before the Law, both of Moses & the circumcision, & had been called a father of all believers. With that also the Law much rather works wrath than grace, since no one does

it with desire & love that much rather it disavors comes than the work of the Law than favor. Therefore only faith must receive the grace promised to Abraham. For such examples are also written for our sake, that we also should believe.

"On the fifth (chapter) he comes to the fruits & works of faith, which are these: peace, joy, (and) love ever against God & everyone, together with certainty, trust, joyousness, courage, & hope in tribulation & suffering. For all that believe where faith really is, for the sake of the boundless good, which God has shown to us in Christ, that He permitted Him to die for us, before we could ask Him for that, yet, when we were still enemies. Thus we then have it, that faith without any works justifies, & still it does not follow from that, that one should therefore do no good works, but that the righteous works do not remain away, of which the work-righteous know nothing, & invent for themselves their own works, in which there is neither peace, joy, certainty, love, hope, comfort, nor any form of real Christian work & faith. Thereafter he makes an amazing outburst & promise & relates from whence come both sin & unrighteousness, death & life; & he sets the two

over against one another, Adam & Christ. Thus he would say: Therefore Christ must come, a second Adam, who offers His righteousness to us thru a new spiritual birth in faith, just as that Adam brought sin upon us thru the old fleshly birth. But thereby is it made manifest & confirmed, that no one can help himself out of sin to righteousness with works, as little as he can prevent his being born bodily. It is

also thereby proven that the divine Law, which still so reasonably should help, should help somewhat to righteousness, does not come only without sign, but has also increased sin, therefore, that the evil nature becomes the more hostile to it, & its desire would satisfy itself the more, the more the Law hinders it. Thus the Law makes Christ the more necessary, & demands more grace, which helps the nature.

"In the sixth (chapter) he proposes the special work of faith, the battle of the spirit with the flesh, to put to death completely the remaining sin & lusts which remain after justification, & teaches us that we are thus not freed from sin through faith, that we should not be idle, lazy, & certain, as if there were no more sin there. Sin is there, but it shall not be reckoned for condemnation for the sake of the faith, which strives against it. Therefore we have enough to do with ourselves our whole life long, that we restrain our body, put to death its lusts, & overcome its members, so that they are obedient to the Spirit & not to the lusts, whereby we are like the death & resurrection of Christ & fulfill our Baptismal (which also signifies the death of sin & a new life of grace), until we completely clean of sin, also are raised up with Christ & live eternally. And that we can do, he says, because we are under grace & not under the Law. What he himself explains, that to be without Law, has not said so much, that one has no Law & might do what one desires, but to be under the Law is to go about with the works of the Law without grace. Then sin certainly reigns thro' the Law, since no one is by nature friendly to the Law; that in itself is gross sin. Grace, however, makes the Law pleasing to us; then there is no more sin there, & the Law is no more against us, but is one with us. But that is the real freedom from sin & from the Law, of which he writes to the end of this chapter, that it is a freedom only to do good with desire & to live well without the compulsion of the Law. Therefore this freedom is a spiritual freedom, which does not annul the Law, but presents what is demanded by the Law, namely, desire & love, whereby the Law is stilled & has nothing more to exercise & demand. Just as if you were in debt to a liege lord & could not pay. From that you might become free in two old manners: first, that he takes nothing from you & tears up your record; the other time, that a devout man pays for you & gives to you, so that you are enough for your record. In this manner Christ has made us free from the Law. Therefore it is not a wild, fleshly freedom, which should do nothing, but which does many & all sorts of things, & is unencumbered from the demands & guilt of the Law.

"In the seventh (chapter) he confirms such things with a comparison of the married life. When a husband dies, then is the wife also free, & one is thus free & released

of the other. Not so, that the wife may or should not take another husband, but that now first of all she is really free to take another, which she previously could not do, before she was free of her husband. Thus is our conscience bound under the Law, under the sinful old man; when he is put to death thru the Spirit, then is the conscience free, & the one is released of the other. Not that the conscience should do nothing, but now first of all really cling to Christ, the other man, & bring forth the fruit of life. Thereafter he moves further out of the way of sin & of the Law, as thru the Law sin now really reigns & becomes powerful. For the old man only becomes more hostile to the Law, because he cannot say what is demanded by the Law. For sin is his nature, & he can do nothing else of himself; therefore the Law is his death & all his torment. Not that the Law is evil, but that the evil nature cannot endure the good, that it demands good from him, just as a sick person cannot endure that one demands of him running & jumping & other works of a well person. Therefore St. Paul concludes here that, where the Law is really known & comprehended best of all, there it does no more than that it reminds us of our sin & puts us to death thru the same, & makes us guilty of eternal wrath, how that all teaches

itself nicely & experiences in the Conscience, when it is really concerned with the Law, that one must have something else & more than the Law to make man do it & to save him. But those who do not really know the Law are blind, go about with boldness, & think to do enough for it with works, for they do not know how much the Law demands, namely, a spontaneous, happy heart; therefore they do not see Moses correctly, the cloth has been laid over & has covered them. After that he shows how Spirit & flesh strive against one another in one man & sets himself up as an example, so that we learn correctly to know the work of cutting to death the sin within ourselves. But he calls both the Spirit & the flesh a law, therefore, that just as it is a way of the divine Law, that it drives & demands, so the flesh drives & demands & rages against the Spirit, & would have its desires. On the other hand, the Spirit drives & demands contrary to the flesh & would have its desires. This contention wages within us as long as we live, in one more, in another less, accordingly, as the Spirit or the flesh becomes stronger. And still the whole man is himself both Spirit & flesh, which strive within him, until he becomes completely Spirit.

) "In the eighth (chapter) he comforts such contenders, so that they do not condemn such flesh, & shows further what is the manner of flesh & Spirit & how the Spirit comes from Christ, who has given us His Holy Spirit, who makes us spiritual & suppresses the flesh, & assures us, that we are nevertheless children of God, how hard also the sin rages within us, so long as we follow the Spirit & strive against sin to put it to death. But because

nothing is so good to deafen the flesh as cross & suffering, he comforts us in suffering thru the support of the spirit of love & of all creatures, namely, that both the spirit groans within us & the creature yearns with us, that we be free from the flesh & sin. Thus we see that these three chapters, 6-8, set in motion the one work of faith, which there reads, to put to death the old Adam & to overcome the flesh.

"In the ninth, tenth, & eleventh chapters he teaches of the of the eternal providence (Vorsehung) of God; thence it flows originally, who should believe & not believe, who can be free of sin or not be free; by which it is taken completely out of our hands & placed into the hand of God, that we become upright. And that is necessary in the highest degree. For we are so weak & uncertain, that, if it were up to us, then not one man would be saved; the devil would certainly overcome all of them. But now God is certain that His provision cannot fail Him, nor can anyone prevent Him; we still have hope against sin. Also hier ist den freveln und hochfahrenden Geistern ein Mal zu stecken, die ihrem Verstand am ersten hieher führen, und oben anheben, zu vor den Abgrund göttlicher Vorsehung zu forschen, und vergänglich damit sich bekümmern, ob sie vorsehen sind. They must then come down in themselves, so that they either lose courage or risk themselves in the open hazard. But you follow this Epistle in its order, concern yourself about Christ & the Gospel, so that you know your sin & His grace, & thereafter strive with sin, as that has been taught here in chap. 1-5. Thereafter, when you have come to the 8. (chapter), under cross & suffering, that will teach you correctly the reconciliation in chap. 13-14, how comforting it is. For without suffering, cross, & perils of death one cannot treat of the reconciliation without injury & secret wrath against God. Therefore must Adam first be really dead, before he suffers this thing & drinks the strong wine. Therefore take care that you do not drink wine, when you are still an infant. Every doctrine has its measure, time, & age.

"On the twelfth (chapter) he teaches the correct worship & makes all Christians into priests, that they should offer sacrifice; not gold or cattle, as in the Law, but their own bodies, with the mortification of the lusts. Thereafter he describes the outward conduct of the Christians in the spiritual realm, how they should teach, preach, rule, serve, give, suffer, love, live & act over against friend, foe, & everyone. These are the works which a Christian does. For, as has been said, Faith never takes a holiday.

"In the thirteenth (chapter) he teaches to honor & to be obedient to the civil realm, which is therefore ordained; altho it really does not make the people devout before God, still it does so much, that the devout have outward peace & protection, & the evil ones without fear or with peace & quiet, cannot do their evil freely. Darum es zu ehren ist, auch den Frommen, ob sie wohl

sein nicht dürfen. Finally, however, he includes all things in love, & concludes it in the example of Christ, as He has done for us, that we also do thus & follow after Him.

"In the fourteenth (chapter) he teaches to gently lead the weak conscience in, faith & to take care of them, so that one does not use the freedom of the Christians to injury but to the furtherance of the weak. For where one does not do that, there follows discord & a despising of the Gospel, whereon all need still lies; that it is better to give way a little to the weak, until they become stronger, than that the teaching of the Gospel should suffer. And such a work is a special work of love, which is really also needful now, when one throws into confusion inevitably & roughly without any need with the eating of flesh & the freedom of the weak consciences, before they recognize the truth.

"In the fifteenth (chapter) he sets up Christ as an example, that we should also endure the other weak one, when they are otherwise in manifest sin or by disagreeable habits; whom one must not cast away but bear, until they also become better. For thus has Christ already done to us & still does daily, so that He bears very many vices & evil habits, together with every defect, in us, & helps without intermission. Thereby, too, at the close, he prays for them, & praises them & commits them to God, & declares his office & preaching, & very sincerely requests of them aid for the poor at Jerusalem; & it is real love of which he speaks & with which he walks.

"The last chapter is a chapter of greetings; but therein he intermixes a very noble warning against doctrines of men, which there make inroads into the evangelical teaching & cause dissention, even as he had certainly seen, that out of Rome & by the Romans there should come the corrupt, scandalous, canons & decretals & the entire ranks & vermin of human laws & commandments, which now drown the whole world & have destroyed this Epistle & all Holy Scripture, together with the spirit & faith, so that nothing more remains there than the idol's belly, whose servants St. Paul here calls them. God preserve us from them. Amen.

"Thus, in the richest manner we find in this Epistle what a Christian should know, namely, what is Law, Gospel, sin, punishment, grace, faith, righteousness, Christ, God, good works, love, hope, and cross, & how we should conduct ourselves over against everyone,

be he devout or sinner, strong or weak, friend or foe, & over against ourselves. To that end have all things been excellently established with writings, proven with examples of himself & of the prophets, so that nothing more is to be desired here. Therefore it also appears as if St. Paul in this Epistle wanted to draw up the entire Christian & evangelical doctrine for once in a short statement & prepare an introduction into the entire Old Testament. Here without

doubt, whoever has this Epistle well in his heart has the light & power of the Old Testament in him. Therefore let every Christian be exercised in it generally & constantly. For that may God give us grace. Amen."

6. Literature.

The Letter to the Romans has experienced numerous treatments. We mention here only the better known & more significant ones. In a complete list of the larger & smaller writings here referred to there is nothing in general, it would also be difficult to present. From the ancient church we have expositions of the Letter by Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, & the so-called Ambrosian, & then of Occumenius, from the 10. century & of Theophylact from the 11. century. The best known old Lutheran expositors of the Letter to the Romans are: Melancthon, Annotationes 1522; Commentarius 1532; Bugenhagen, Annotationes 1523; Osiander, Commentarius 1582; Placcius in his Glossa, 1570; Keimer, Commentarius 1573; Hunnius, Expositio 1577; Balduin, Commentarius 1611; Labor in his Biblia Illustrata; Bengel, Encomen. d. d. Reformed expositors we mention Labrin, Bez, Bucer, Loeccius, Grotius. The most noteworthy recent commentators of the Letter to the Romans are: Tholuck 1825; Quackert 1831; Bishausen 1835; de Wet 1835; Hritschke 1836-43; Schott 1838; Hodge of Princeton 1844; Philippi, Third Edition, 1855; Lange, Bibelwerk 1867; von Hofmann 1868; Meyer, Fifth Edition, 1872; Volkmar 1875; Rodet 1881; Klostermann, Vorlesungen zur bisherigen Erklärung des Römerbriefs 1881; Weiss 1883, 1886; Luthardt, Strack & Goeckler'scher Kommentar 1887, Ebrard 1890. Of the Roman (Cath.) theologians who have occupied themselves with the Letter to the Romans, there are mentioned Al Esle and Cornelius a Lapide from the 17. century, H. Meyer and Gipping of recent times. In our exposition we have taken into consideration more or less the most of the commentators mentioned, besides many monographs regarding arrangement, character, tendency, or some special parts of the Letter, as well as explanations of the foremost ides doctrinae contained in the Letter from ancient & recent times. Here we avoid any consideration of a characterization of the different exegetical peculiarities & theological inclinations of the expositors, since these shall come out sufficiently in the exposition.

28.
1, 3-5.

just any sacred writings or holy documents, but the concrete thing, the sacred Scriptures of Israel, the Old Testament canon. As here in their introduction of the Letter to the Romans, so also otherwise Paul has often referred to the fact that his doctrine corresponds with the testimony of the prophets. "We declare unto you... the promise which was made unto the fathers." Acts 13, 32. "I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small & great, saying none other things than those which the prophets & Moses did say should come." Acts 23, 22. What is also very comforting for us, that we know that the preaching of the Gospel, which is still current among us, is nothing else than the ancient truth, which God has manifested to His people from the beginning.

1, 3-5.

After the Apostle had pointed to the divine source of the Gospel, for which he had been separated, as well as to its agreement with the Scriptures, he names the content of the same. We refer $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \omicron \upsilon \nu \nu \iota \omicron \upsilon \alpha \delta \tau \omicron \upsilon$ to the chief concept $\epsilon \upsilon \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$. It is the Gospel of God concerning His Son. God Himself testifies here concerning His Son. Thus in Rom. 15, 19 Paul designates this Gospel as the Gospel of Christ. Concerning Christ have all the prophets prophesied, to Christ the whole Scripture points. And Christ is the Son of God "His Son." "God's Son" is here, as elsewhere in the Scriptures, as little the mere title of the office of the Messiah, but here, as everywhere in the Scriptures, points to the unique relationship of Christ to God. Christ appears to the Apostle Paul in the same manner as to the Apostle John, as "the only-begotten of the Father," John 1, 14. In just this Letter he calls Him God's "own Son," Rom. 8, 32, & therefore "God over all," Rom. 9, 5. And in Col. 1, 15 he writes concerning Him: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature, for by him were all things created." In the prophetic Scriptures already God had testified concerning the Messiah: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee."

The content of the Gospel "concerning his Son" is modified by two attributes. First of all it is remarked that the Son of God "hinge kōmmen ist," $\tau \omicron \upsilon \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \omicron \nu \epsilon \nu \omicron \iota$, "born of woman, David's" ("was made of the seed of David"), that is, from the family of David, "nach dem Fleische" ("according to the flesh"), that is, with regard to His human nature. The Son of God, this Person who had been from eternity, had in the process of time, in conformity with the promise of the prophets, assumed the flesh & blood of the children of men, from Mary, a daughter of David. He remained who He was; He had received the human nature into the unity of His person. And for this new existence, into which He entered with His earthly birth, the flesh was now first of all the deciding factor. He has become like His brethren in all

things; He was found in fashion as a man. In this incarnation, He had one weakness, as man. He walked visibly upon earth, all the peculiarities, also the weaknesses & infirmities of the human nature. But then there entered in a change of circumstances, to which the second attribute calls our attention.

It reads, further, 4: 41 τοῦ ἐπιθεῖν τοῦ νόου θεοῦ ἐν ἐν ἡμῖν, etc. ἐπὶ σημαίνει: "abgrenzen" (to fix the limits of), "abschliessen" (to decide, determine), "bestimmen" (to decide, define); thus in profane Greek & also in the New Testament, cf. Luke 22, 22; Acts 2, 23; 11, 29; 17, 26, 31; Heb. 4, 7. Joined with a double accusative of the persons it means nothing other than: "Command as to what is determined" (to intend one for something), "erkennen" (to designate), "ordnen" (to appoint), "bestimmen" (to make one into something), "constituere" (to appoint), to establish one in a function, in an office, constitute. The latter definition, according to which the verb includes in itself the accomplishment of the determination, is without doubt established by the word of the author in Michas 6, 12: 12, 7: ἐπὶ ἡμῖν ἐπὶ θεῷ ἐπιθεῖν, "dies hat ein Hämorrhoiden gemacht". And in this sense is the word also employed in the foregoing document, since here only one act can be meant, which follows upon

the act first mentioned, τοῦ γενομένου. To the ἐπὶ θεῷ of our passage corresponds the ἐπὶ θεῷ in Acts 2, 33: "Set all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord & Christ." But now it would be absurd, if it would read that the Son of God, who was this from the beginning, had been established or placed as the Son of God. Therefore, as also Philippi, Hoffmann, Weiss, & already ancient expositors construe it, we combine νοῦν θεοῦ with the following ἐν ἐν ἡμῖν into one concept: Christ is set as that, to be "the Son of God with power", Constitutus est filius Dei potens. He has been established in the position of absolute, divine majesty & power, in the status glorie. First, in the state of His humiliation, He had given room to the weakness of the human nature, had kept His divine majesty hidden behind the form of the servant. But then He has entered into the full possession & use of His divine omnipotence & glory. And certainly the latter is said even of the Son of God, who had come according to the flesh, from the family of David. The Son of David is now the Son of God in power. The incarnate Son of God now rules also according to His human nature unlimited divine authority. The

expression "the Son of God with power" is still modified by κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν ἡμῖν, "nach dem Geist der Herrlichkeit" (according to the spirit of holiness). Πνεῦμα designates here, where κατὰ πνεῦμα forms the contrast to κατὰ σάρκα, similarly as in 1 Tim. 3, 16; 1 Pet. 3, 18; cf. also Heb. 9, 14, the other, higher side of existence, the "divine principle" in Christ, the other, "higher, heavenly, divine nature of Christ." Philippi The Son of God, like God the

Father, is Πνεῦμα, John 4, 24, is also directly called το Πνεῦμα, 11 Cor. 3, 17. And this Πνεῦμα is a spirit of holiness in the sense as God is the Holy One & is called in the sense of "göttlicher Überweltlichkeit." The apostle here uses the unusual expression Πνεῦμα ἅγιον instead of Πνεῦμα ἁγίον, so that one does not think of the third Person of the Godhead, who is generally designated as the Holy spirit. The ἁγία here, as the facts themselves bring it out, assigns not so much the relation, but much more the norm. Christ is now the Son of God in majesty & officiates as such according to the measure of His divine, heavenly way and nature. It is the eternal Godhead, which now, since He is exalted to God, comes forward, predominates in Christ & determines His entire being, His manner of existence. That Christ is true, essential God comes to acceptance in the fact that He has & exercises all power in heaven & on earth. The divine form & nature now also with its heavenly splendor penetrates, shines thru His human essence. Christ now finds Himself in a spiritual, heavenly, glorified body & life. The apostle winds up this description of the status glorie with the addition ἐξ ἁγιάσεως καὶ κτίσεως. The ἐξ does not point to the temporal but to the actual result. Thru His resurrection from the dead Christ has been translated into the condition of majestic glory, into this manner of existence of His, which is actual, heavenly, like to God. Christ has died & with His death He has forever laid aside the human weakness. For He has risen from the dead, & as a result of this He is now the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness. It does not read ἐξ ἁγιάσεως καὶ κτίσεως, altho self-evidently Christ's resurrection is meant. The emphasis lies on the concept ἁγιάσεως καὶ κτίσεως. The apostle emphasizes that it was a resurrection from the dead, which Christ experienced in Himself, & that it is therefore a life out of death, an entirely new life & being, in which Christ now stands, an entirely different conditioned life than that was, in which He had first entered with His physical birth. Moreover that which Paul says here of the humiliation & exaltation of Christ is prophesied by the prophets of God, for example, Ps. 22; Isa. 53.

After the apostle has placed in the brightest the person of Him, of whom his Gospel treats, he designates the same with His well-known, historical name, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and adds to that, τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, in that he thereby gives us to consider what we Christians have in this Christ. This Jesus Christ, as He is just described, is our Lord. The Son of God with His life, suffering, & death in the flesh has redeemed us & acquired won us for Himself, & the Lord, who has been exalted to God, now blesses us out of His divine fulness, guides & rules, guards & protects us with His divine power & omnipotence. He is our Lord, & we are His own; He is the Lord, whom we serve, to whom we live & die.

But now it is also this Lord Jesus Christ, to whom Paul owes the special grace which had

been imparted to him: "durch welchen wir empfangen haben Gnade und Apostelamt" ("by whom we have received grace & apostleship"). According to the common usage of language Paul speaks of himself as the author of the Letter in the first person of the plural. He had received a special gift of grace, cf. Eph. 3, 8, and which consisted in his apostleship. $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$ καὶ ἀποστολήν is an "Hendiadysion". Thru the Lord Christ he had received this gift. The $\text{Si}^2 \sigma\tilde{\iota}$ does not obligate us to regard Christ only as the mediator of grace, but God the Father, on the other hand as the real originator of the same. Where $\text{Si}^2 \sigma\tilde{\iota}$ is not expressly set over against the $\text{Si}^1 \sigma\tilde{\iota}$, it is often also, as Grimm expresses himself, used de causa efficiente and also designates that, qui pariter auctor et instrumentum actionis est. Thus in Heb. 2, 10 it is said of the Father that all things are by Him, $\text{Si}^2 \sigma\tilde{\iota}$; 1 Cor. 1, 9, that we are called thru Him. In Gal. 1, 1 Paul attests that he had become an Apostle just as much thru Christ as thru God the Father. And so also otherwise he leads his apostleship at one time back to Christ, at another time back to God the Father (Rom. 15, 15). In the report of the calling of Paul in the lists of the Apostles the exalted Christ appears especially as the One who called & sent Paul to the heathen. Corresponding to that we take Christ in our passage simply as the distributor of the gift which Paul received. The

purpose of his apostleship Paul gives here with the words: $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ ὑπακοήν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, that is, to work, to establish the obedience of faith among the Gentiles. He had been called especially to the Gentile apostleship. Rom. 1, 14; 11, 13; 15, 16; Eph. 3, 8. By his service the obedience of faith should come to pass among the Gentiles. In the expression ὑπακοήν πίστεως, the latter word is genitivus copulativus. The obedience consists in faith. The Christian faith is essentially obedience over against the Word of God, therefore the expressions ὑπακοήν πίστεως, Rom. 10, 16; 11, 13; 1, 5; ἀπειθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ or τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, 1 Pet. 2, 8; 4, 17. Paul was separated as an Apostle for the proclamation of the Gospel of God concerning His Son. Even this preaching, however, at the same time works the faith in that concerning which it speaks; the Gospel of God itself works faith, acceptance. And then this faith works for the glorification of the name of Christ, $\text{Si}^2 \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. In that the believing Gentiles call upon Christ as their Lord, they honor & praise His name. This statement of Paul concerning his apostleship in v. 5 is not only loosely, not only outwardly joined to the former remarks by $\text{Si}^2 \sigma\tilde{\iota}$, but stands with the same in closest connection. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord, of whom

the Gospel treats, proves His divine power & dominion also therein, that He Himself chooses, calls, & prepares instruments, like Paul, who proclaim this Gospel, & that thru these human instruments & their preaching He Himself works the obedience of faith, to the honor of His name.

Now the Apostle turns to the readers & recipients of this letter of his, the Roman Christians. They also, in the majority, belong to the Gentiles, & certainly to those Gentiles who are already the called of Jesus Christ. The genitive $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is not to be taken as the genitive of cause, but as the genitive of relationship. For the Father otherwise always appears in the letters of Paul as the One who calls those who are afar off, calls them to Christ. Cf. Rom. 8, 30; 9, 24; 1 Cor. 1, 9; 1, 15, 17; 1 Thes. 2, 12; 1 Thes. 2, 14; 1 Tim. 1, 9. God has called those who are now Christians, & by the power of this call they now belong to Jesus Christ. The expressions $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\iota$ in the Pauline Epistles, where the discussion concerns the general Christian call, always designates a call which is not only powerful & active, but also includes the result in itself. Calling is there always identical with conversion. Thru the call of God, which goes out in the Gospel, we are called, drawn to Christ, transplanted into the communion of the Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. 1, 9. Thus $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\iota$ in itself alone, for example, Rom. 5, 25; 1 Cor. 1, 24, has become a characterization, a title of the Christians. In our passage, v. 7, as, for example, also in 1 Cor. 1, 1, moreover, they are called $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\iota\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$, called saints. Thru the call of God they have become saints, separated from the world & consecrated, devoted to God. *Non ideo vocati sunt, quia sancti erant, sed ideo sancti effecti, quia vocati sunt.* Augustine. The other surname of the Roman Christians & Christians in general, $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ v. 7, since it is placed before the $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\iota\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$, points to the fact that God has proven His great love to those who are now Christians, in that He called them, made them into believers & saints. To these Gentile Christians, who are therefore the beloved of God, the called of Jesus Christ, the called saints, Paul now turns, to them he presents his greetings, for them the foregoing document is meant. The simple dative, $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\iota\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \pi\upsilon\mu\eta$, includes in itself greetings & dedication, similarly as in other letter headings. And certainly the Apostle turns to all, $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$, who are in Rome, to the collective members of the local congregation, who appear to him as the beloved of God & called saints, just as we also regard all the members of an orthodox Christian congregation in love as the beloved children of God, as beloved fellow Christians, & should not let ourselves be urged & influenced by the fact that hypocrites are also intermingled among the Christians. Naturally it is hereby presumed that those members of a Christian congregation who become manifest as non-Christians are then also separated from the congregation.

As such an one as he had just characterized himself, v. 1-5, Paul directs this writing of his to the Roman Christians. As a called Apostle, who has a commission especially to the Gentiles, he would now speak & deal with the Christians in Rome & first of all proclaim to them in writing the Gospel to which he had been separated. Even tho they had already some

the obedience of faith without his assistance, still more so than he will be would strengthen & exhort them in the faith. The Gospel, however, and that which he here writes in the Letter to the Romans, is the Gospel of God, God's Word, thus forms a rock, the all-certain truth. And also what Paul has said concerning the content of his Gospel stands in close relationship to the principle content of this Letter. It certainly offers no complete christological discussions, but treats of soteriological subjects, above all, the subject of our redemption & justification. But the article concerning the divinity of Christ, to which the Apostle writes so emphatically in the introduction of his Letter, also stands in the center of soteriology. If Christ is not the only-begotten Son of God, true, essential God, then our redemption, justification & salvation fall away.

Instead of closing with the usual $\chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$ in the formula of greetings of his Letters, the Apostle ends his greeting with the real Christian benediction: "Gnade mit euch und Friede von Gott dem Vater und dem Herrn Jesus Christo" ("Grace to you & peace from God our Father, & the Lord Jesus Christ"). "Gnade," $\chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$, grace is the free goodness & favor of God, which proves itself especially in the forgiveness of sins; "Friede," $\epsilon \iota \rho \eta \nu \eta$, peace, the objective condition of peace in which we stand to God. Believing Christians already have grace & peace. Thus the wish of the Apostle is that grace & peace increase themselves, so that they become established in this condition of grace, in their relationship of peace to God. May God, our Father grant that to them, who has been reconciled to us thru Christ & the Lord Jesus Christ, who has merited grace & peace for us. Both nouns are dependent upon $\alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$. Christ appears together with the Father as the "coordinierte Mitcausalität" (Lutherolt). That presumes, however, that Christ is coordinated with the Father according to His essence, according to His person.

1, 8-15. The Introduction of the Letter.

1, 8-10.

The Letter itself the Apostle does not begin, as the first Letter to the Thessalonians & the first Letter to the Corinthians, with an assurance that he always gives thanks to God for the readers, but similarly, as in the second Letter to the Corinthians, with a thanksgiving itself. "Thanks always stands at the beginning in the Christian life & reasonably precedes all petitions & wishes." Lutherolt. It reads: $\tau \rho \acute{\alpha} \pi \sigma \iota \varsigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \dot{\iota} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau \omega \tau \omega \tau \omega \theta \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. The $\mu \epsilon \nu$, which has no correlate in the following, serves only to bring the $\tau \rho \acute{\alpha} \pi \sigma \iota \varsigma$, "give thanks, first, correctly into prominence. The Apostle calls the God, to whom he gives thanks, his God. $\theta \epsilon \omega$

verbum, Deus meus, exprimit fidem, amorem, spem atque adeo totam religionem nostram. Bengel. The expressions refer both to his personal relationship as well as his relationship to God in his calling. "Mein Gott," that is the God of whom I am & whom I serve, ὁ ὡς ἐγὼ, ὃς καὶ λατρεύω: Acts 27, 23. Paul gives thanks to his God thru Jesus Christ; the thanks is mediated thru Christ, as far as that, for which a Christian gives thanks to God, is a benefit mediated thru Christ, merited & earned by Christ. The beloved name of Jesus Christ, which Paul had already mentioned three times, in the superscription of greeting, in the introduction, in the middle, & at the end, stands also at the head of the Letter itself. That for which the apostle gives thanks to his God is the faith of his readers, the Roman Christians. He thanks God for them all, & certainly for the fact that their faith is spoken of in the whole world. Every-where in the whole civilized world men spoke of the fact that there was now also a group of believing Christians in Rome, the capital of the world. That the faith of the Romans became so well known is proof for the genuineness & purity of the same. And in this manner, the Christ, in whom the Christians believe, was at the same time generally known, had likewise become the general topic of the day. How could the apostle to the Gentiles not rejoice & give thanks to God, that now also already in the very center of the Gentile world the obedience of faith had been established, & that from thence the report of Christ had spread thru the entire Roman Empire?

Such giving of thanks of the apostle cracks observation; it is a secret transaction between him & his God. Therefore, for this reason Paul appeals to God as a witness; God knows how incessantly he recalls the Roman congregation before His countenance. The latter should receive an impression from that, as to how he is minded over against them. The Roman congregation, which had arisen without his activity, & had remained personally unacquainted with him until this time, lay on his heart just like those Gentile congregations which he had founded. In this connection the apostle remarks that he served God in his spirit in the Gospel of His Son: ὡς λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. He served God in the Gospel of Christ, which he proclaimed, & this service is a service to God, λατρεία, a sacrifice, which he presented to God, & certainly at the same time an inner service to God. The modifier ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου does not say that he performed such service only outwardly for appearance sake, only mechanically, but that his inward self, his heart was in it, which was understood of itself & was of no consequence to be mentioned here. Paul much rather calls attention to the fact that he takes the service in the Gospel into his inner life, which he lives before God, & thus also into his prayer-life. A righteous servant of the Word serves God in the Gospel not only when he deals with men & publicly & privately proclaims the Word, but also then,

35
1, 11, 12.

when he deals & does business with his God alone, when he discusses there before God with God how he might best carry out his office, how he might correctly impart the Word, & when he prays for them whom he serves with the Word. And thus before God Paul also considers the Roman Christians & thus even already now, when he was still absent, he performed among them the duties of the office which had been commissioned to him in the Gospel.

And the Apostle considers the Christians in Rome not only in the giving of thanks but also in petitions. At all times he also pleaded in his prayers. And his wish & prayer was especially directed to the fact whether it might finally be granted him to come to them, Εἴπω, ἢ ὅτι ποτε. Εὐδοῶ ὑμᾶς, etc. Εὐδοῶ means really exeditemus iter probere, but in the passive, in the classical as well as in the New Testament Greek it always has the tropical meaning succesum habere, "guten Erfolg", "Glück haben". Cf. 1 Cor. 16, 2; 3 John 2. Paul adds: Εἰ τὸ θεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ, "kraft des Willens Gottes" ("by the will of God"). The result is in the hand & will of God. God, whose omnipotent hand directs & fashions the circumstances, can very well & shall certainly direct & ordain it in His time & permit it to bring joy to the Apostle, that he might come to Rome.

1, 11, 12.

The Apostle now gives the basis of his petition. He was anxious to see the Roman Christians face to face, so that he might impart to them some spiritual gift thru the proclamation of the Gospel. What he then works among them thru instruction, exhortations & comfort is not ascribed to the influence of his human individuality, but is a πνευματικόν, a gift of the grace of God, which was imparted to them thru the Spirit of God. It is the Spirit of God, who works all good in man thru the human word. The purpose of such communication is that they might be strengthened & established. They already stand in faith, but they still really need the strengthening of faith. But at the same time, in that he instructed & strengthened them, Paul himself would receive a blessing. That he strengthen them, τὸ ἐντιμῶς ὑμᾶς, includes in itself that he himself would be comforted & encouraged among them, in their midst, ἐν ὑμῶν παρῶν ὡς καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν. And certainly such mutual help & strengthening takes place thru the mutual faith, their faith & his, εἰς τὴν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ πίστιν, ἡμῶν τε καὶ ὑμῶν. In the Roman Christians dwelt & lived the same faith which animated the Apostle. But also, when they are together, both would prove to one another their mutual faith, he his, in that he would teach & instruct them, present testimony to them of his faith, they theirs, in that they would accept with joy his word as God's

Word. And the former would redound to the strengthening & encouragement of the Roman Christians; the latter to the strengthening & encouragement of the Epistle. The instruction from God's Word is never one-sided, that the one only gives, the other only receives. Reciprocal action always takes place. Whoever teaches & strengthens others himself has blessing from that & is himself edified, in that he becomes aware how the Word, which comes from his lips, takes effect & is kindled in the hearts & proves itself as a power of God.

1, 13-15.

The Apostle had previously remarked that he wished & prayed that he might finally have the joy of coming to Rome. He had long had in mind such a journey. And now he expressly assures the Roman Christians, his beloved brethren, that he had often proposed to come to them, cf. Acts 19, 21, only he had previously been hindered in the carrying out of his intention. By what he was hindered he states in 15, 20-22. He was first of all appointed to proclaim Christ in all places in the Orient, where the name of Christ was still not known. A more closely lying task had held him back. In himself there lay no motive for looking away from & giving up this journey, or for postponing this proposed journey. And least of all a certain indifference over against the Roman congregation, which had arisen without his assistance, had not kept him away from Rome. As the purpose of his intention to come to Rome, he says here: *ἵνα τὴν καρπὸν ὁχλῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἑθνεσίν*. He also wanted to have some fruit in Rome, the same as among the other Gentile nations. With the *ἐν ὑμῖν*, "inter euch" ("among you"), he here speaks to his readers not as Christians but as Romans. So also Hofmann, Schott, Godet. With the "fruit" he means not only in general the result of his labor. The fruit which the Apostle otherwise had among the Gentile nations consisted in the Gentiles whom he had won for Christ. Such living fruit, which consisted in human souls, the Lord has in mind, when He says: "He that receiveth wages, & gathereth fruit unto life eternal." John 4, 36. So also in Rome Paul might win some Gentiles for the Kingdom of heaven. In other large cities, in Corinth, in Ephesus, he had gathered a full harvest. In Rome, on the other hand, where a congregation was already on hand, he would bear with it contentedly if he could only add a handful of gleanings to the sheaves gathered by another. Only at "some fruit" *τὴν καρπὸν*, had he aimed at there. He, he himself, would have fruit. The converted Gentiles are fruit, gain for him. The souls which as preachers of the Gospel have won for Christ with his preaching shall be accredited to him by the Lord of the harvest as having been won by him; they shall be set to his account, so that he can boast of his gain on the day of Jesus Christ. Phil. 2, 13. That it is a two-fold thing

37.
112-15.

that Paul has in mind with his projected journey to Rome. With his preaching of the Gospel he would strengthen the Christians & win still other Gentiles.

The following statement, 1.17, made the purpose of the Apostle to come to Rome, for the last named reason back to the obligation which had been laid upon him with the Gentile apostleship. He is a debtor, ὁφειλέτης, to all the Gentile nations. With his call he had received & taken over a debt over against the entire Gentile world, which he now paid with the proclamation of the Gospel. The Apostle here differentiates between two classes of Gentiles, the Greeks & the barbarians. Otto quotes on this from Dionysius Halic. *neque enim nuda appellatione aut lingua dumtaxat proprietate Graecae a barbaris distinguimus, sed prudentia bonisque institutione et moribus.* Thus this differentiation falls together with the others, the differentiation between the wise & the unwise, the educated & the uneducated. Self-evidently the Romans are included in the first class, as heero once remarked, *de fin. 2.15: non solum Graecia et Italia, sed etiam omnis barbaria.* As to the other Paul owed the Gospel. Thus it is well to say: "The Gospel of Christ is meant for the uncivilized nations in like manner as for the civilized. Barbarism is as little a hindrance to the operation of the Gospel as worldly culture & education in themselves are useful to it."

What Paul has to say concerning his wish & intention to come to Rome he concludes in 1.15 with the words: οὕτω τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμος καὶ εὐὺς τῷ ἔργῳ εὐαγγελισ-
αὶ βαί. It is inadmissible, as Meyer does, to separate τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ from πρόθυμος and to take the sentence in the sense: "Sonach, was mich anlangt, so bin ich bereit, etc." For πρόθυμος alone is not synonymous with πρόθυμα ἔστι, "I am in readiness, or πρόθυμος εἰμι, therefore I am ready. Much rather we take τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμος as one expression, but we rather translate with Weiss & Philippson, in that we add ἔστι: "Sonach geht meine Bereitwilligkeit dahin, auch euch, den Römern, das Evangelium zu verkündigen," ^{then} with Hoffmann: "So steht es um die bei mir vorhandene Bereitwilligkeit." Thus the meaning is this: "Therefore, because I owe the Gospel to all Gentiles, Greeks & barbarians, I am prepared on my part to preach the Gospel also to you Romans. Only before this God had it not made it possible, much rather hindered him from setting into operation that for which he was ready & willing."

Also, from that which Paul expressed concerning his desire & intention to come to them, the Roman Christians could discover how he stood over against them & would the more willingly give ear to that which he was prepared to write. For to be sure, the Apostle at that time was still not in a position & it would not be possible for him in the near future,

1/16/17.

Rom. 15, 24 ff., to preach the Gospel to the Romans, & therefore he sent them this Letter of his, which in the meanwhile should compensate for his oral preaching.

1, 16, 12. The Theme of the Letter.

Why he had such a strong desire to preach the Gospel even in Rome the Apostle establishes further with the quality & content of his Gospel. He is not ashamed of the Gospel. It makes no difference in the facts about which it treats whether or not one reads τὸ εὐαγγέλιον after τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in 1. 16. In any case Paul had in mind the Gospel, which, as he had attested previously, speaks of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord. Of this Gospel he did not need to be ashamed even in Rome, the world-capital, the center of worldly education & culture. Why not? It is a power of God to salvation. It is εὐαγγέλιον 1. 3 & 5, a message which stems from God, i.e., and therefore God's power is also active in it, & this divine power grants what no human teaching, no worldly philosophy is able to grant, it helps man to salvation. With σωτηρία is evidently here meant, as so often in the N.T., the completed salvation, "the eternal blessedness." At the very beginning Paul names the last, highest purpose which the Gospel serves, the finis ultimus of the preaching of the Gospel. That to which the Gospel is necessary & serviceable for man already in this time, he states in the following verse. Similarly, as here, he characterizes the message which had been given to him in 1 Cor. 15, 1 ff.: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you... by which also ye are saved," 32 οὕτως καὶ ὡς εἶπα ὅτι. And James points to the high, incomparable worth of the N.T. Word with the remark: "which is able to save your souls," τὸ σωθῆναι ὧς οὐδὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν 1. 1. And certainly for everyone who believes, who accepts it in faith, the Gospel is the power of God to salvation, be he Jew or Greek. The prerogative of Judaism, which the Jews asserted over against the Gentiles, was that the living God had manifested Himself to this people, had revealed His will, His Law to them. The Greeks, who here represented the entire heathen world were the bloom of the development of natural mankind, which is estranged from God. This difference does not come in to consideration over against the message of salvation of the Apostle. Jews & Greeks need the Gospel, if they would be saved. Neither the Law & the works of the Law nor worldly wisdom, education & good breeding in any way help to salvation. Only one form of πίστις claims did the Jews have as the elect people in the Gospel, to which the ἡπαῖροι, ἡ ἑβραϊκή, added to the ἡ ἑλληνική, draws attention. Therefore Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, also always turned first to the Jews found in the Gentile cities, & then to the Gentiles. Acts 13, 46.

The statement, that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation, is established in v. 17 by the fact that righteousness is revealed in it. Righteousness is a preliminary condition of salvation. What shuts man out of heaven, out of salvation is sin. If a sinner becomes a righteous person, then his salvation no longer stands in the way. And certainly this righteousness is defined more closely as $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\gamma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. This expression does not here designate an essential attitude of God, likewise not a morally correct disposition of man brought about by God, much rather, as is almost generally acknowledged, since the righteousness is presented here as a benefit which is designated as a gift for man, the real relationship of man to God, a recognized judgment of God over man, "a condition in which man has God for himself" (Hofmann, Sutherland), or the justitia imputata. As the later amplification of the Epistle shows, the point in question here therefore is that man appears before God, $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, 3, 20, before God, $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, 2, 13; Rom. 3, 11, as a righteous one, appears in the eyes of God as one who is just, as God would have him, in whom God has nothing to find fault with. Then, however, the Sutherland translation, "die Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt," "the righteousness which avails before God," is the adequate expression for the matter of which it treats. Therefore with Hitzsche, Philippi, & the old Lutheran commentators we take $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ as genitivus obiecti and not, as most modern commentators, as genitivus subjecti, although it is correct, that this righteousness, which is regarded by God as such, also proceeds from God, is attributed to man by God himself, as Phil. 3, 9: $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\gamma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon$, as in John 12, 43: $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\gamma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ signifies "Praise vor Gott", "the praise of God", where $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\gamma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ means "Gerechtigkeit vor Gott", "the righteousness of God". The expression of Paul in II Cor. 5, 21, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\gamma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$, leads, as Hitzsche correctly calls our attention to the fact, to no other meaning than this. "damit wir werden in ihm die Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt" (H. v. "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him"). Even this righteousness which avails before God is revealed in the Gospel, "enthüllt", revealed, $\epsilon\pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\psi\epsilon\iota$. That presumes that it is already present, before it is revealed. Only of a thing which actually already exists, only in a hidden manner, can it be said that it is revealed. The righteousness before God is present once & for all in Him, of whom the Gospel speaks, in Christ. Christ has completed it through his life, suffering, & death in the flesh. And because Christ is God's Son, therefore it is an accomplished righteousness, which completely satisfies the great & holy God. Christ, the God-man, has correctly established the relationship of man to God, has procured a gracious judgment of God for sinners. This was certainly hidden from man at first. Men would have known nothing of the appearance of the Son of God in the flesh & of the foundation & purpose of the same, if it would not have been revealed to them expressly. Now

however, the righteousness merited by Christ for sinners is revealed to the children of men in the Gospel, made known to them, & thereby at the same time presented. Recent exegesis has for the most part explained the foregoing expression of the Epistle, that in the Gospel there is manifested to man how, in what manner one succeeds to righteousness, under what condition man can become righteous before God, namely, under the condition of faith. Thus, for example, Philippi: "In the Gospel it (the righteousness) is revealed, insofar as the Gospel contains the report, wherein the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* consists & how it is attained." "Only the Gospel reveals the otherwise veiled way to *δικαιοσύνη* and to *σωτηρία*." Such comments only betray the clear text. That in the Gospel there is manifested the way to righteousness, the rule according to which man becomes righteous & is saved, Paul does not say, but he says that the righteousness itself, even this concrete thing is revealed in the Gospel. The righteousness in which a man before God is placed in prospect in the Gospel not first as a future benefit, which man can attain under certain conditions, or even as a benefit to be merited by man himself, but is presented and offered as an actual, finished gift to man. In the Gospel it is not only made known to men, that they, if they only believe, can become righteous & be saved, but that righteousness is already present for them, that God has already set a gracious judgment over them, that God in Christ looks upon mankind with eyes of satisfaction, that the sinners have a gracious God.

Now, to be sure, however, faith is a necessary addition of this righteousness, which is revealed in the Gospel, only that one correctly designates the relationship of faith to righteousness. Thus the Epistle still adds to the expression in v. 17a the words: *ἐκ πίστεως* *ἐς δικαιοσύνην*. It is absolutely inadmissible, with Hofmann, Sathardt, Weiss, & others, to combine *δικαιοσύνην* with the predicate of the sentence. For such an expression, that the righteousness in the Gospel is manifest in consequence of faith, the assumption that the preaching of the Gospel thus presupposes faith, directly contradicts that which the Apostle had said concerning it in v. 15, that the apostolic proclamation of the Gospel aimed at the working of the obedience of faith among the Gentiles, contradicts in general the relationship of faith & preaching, as it is otherwise attested in Scripture. The questionable words, *ἐκ πίστεως* *ἐς δικαιοσύνην*, are much rather to be taken as a modifier to the principle concept *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, the same as in 3, 22 the righteousness of God is more closely characterized as *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως* *ἡμῶν*. It is a customary idiom of the New Testament also to combine different substantives without articles into one concept by means of prepositions. But one dare scarcely join the two expressions *ἐκ πίστεως* and *ἐς δικαιοσύνην* in the sense of "one believes in faith", so that the growth of faith would thereby be designated. Denn das Wort:

kehren, lag hier kein Anlass vor, und es kann doch für sicher Weise nicht von der
 Gerechtigkeit vor Gott gesagt werden, dass es bei ihm, sondern nur von dem
 Lebenden, dass es bei ihm aus Glauben in Glauben gehe. No, the $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\gamma$ $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon$ is
 characterized on the one hand as a $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\gamma$ $\epsilon\kappa$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, on the other hand as a $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\gamma$
 $\epsilon\kappa$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, and the change of propositions, similarly as in 333, serves the fact to cor-
 rectly bring it into prominence strongly, that here everything is laid on faith, that the
 righteousness of God is the justitia sola fide. The righteousness of God, which is mani-
 fested in the Gospel, is thus, first $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\gamma$ $\epsilon\kappa$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, "eine Gerechtigkeit aus dem
 Glauben," a righteousness from faith. That cannot possibly signify that the righteousness
 comes forth from, grows out of faith as a fruit, that through faith righteousness first
 becomes effective, takes place, since the righteousness is made known & presented in the
 Gospel as an actual gift & power. The righteousness which avails before God is already
 present before preaching & faith. The meaning of the Apostle is this, that the righteousness
 is imparted to us, becomes our own as a result of faith. As soon as one accepts the
 Gospel of Christ in faith, then he has as a result of this also a share in the righteousness

which has prepared in the Gospel & is presented to men. Addit. v. 9. Paulus, quo
 instrumento aut medio hanc justitiam, Deo, id est remissionem peccatorum acqui-
 mur et nobis applicemus, nempe fide. Idcirco dicit ex fide. Körner. The $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\gamma$
 $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon$ is, on the other hand, a $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\gamma$ $\epsilon\kappa$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, that is such a righteousness which
 is designated & aptant for faith, is intended for faith. God, who had procured a right-
 eousness for mankind through Christ, has also established this ordinance, that man lay
 hold of & carry away this righteousness in faith. Man should only simply take that
 which God gives, therefore he is then in possession & use of the great blessing, inclined to
 salvation, life & blessedness.

In order to prove that the previous discussion in v. 16. 17a agrees with the Scriptures
 of the Old Covenant, the Apostle finally appeals to a word of the prophet, Isa. 61: 1: $\kappa\alpha\iota$
 $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma$ $\epsilon\kappa$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\Sigma\eta\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, "wie denn geschrieben steht: Der
 Gerechte wird in Folge des Glaubens leben" ("as it is written, 'The just shall live by faith'").
 He quotes according to the Septuagint, in that he only omits the incorrect $\mu\omega\upsilon$ after $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$.

The Hebrew text reads: $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\Sigma\eta\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. The meaning of the
 prophet is: The righteous shall live by his faith, which is characteristic of him as a righteous
 one, that is, he shall live always, never deteriorate, while the proud & godless do not stand, but
 shall fall. V. 5. With the faith of the righteous nothing else is meant than that the same "clings
 faithfully to God, firmly clings to the Word of promise." Delitzsch. And this prophetic statement

corresponds exactly to that which Paul has said concerning the way which leads to life, to salvation, only that Paul places this Old Testament axiom even in the light of the N. T. The characteristic of the righteous is faith, the faith which grasps & firmly holds the promise of the Gospel; even this faith makes one a righteous one, in that he makes his own the righteousness which is promised & presented in the Gospel; & through such faith the righteous is finally granted life, life in the full sense of the word, the eternal perfect salvation, σωτηρία. The righteousness grasped by & in faith qualifies him for salvation.

And thus also in these two verses, 1, 16, 17, similarly as in 1, 4, 5, the Apostle has presented the short summary of his Gospel, only that here he clearly shows why Christ, the Son of God & the Son of David, is necessary for us. Even this Gospel the Apostle would proclaim in Rome with confident courage, but first he would attest it to the Roman Christians in writing. Very correctly, therefore, ancient & modern commentators see in this sentence, 1, 16, 17, a short index of the foregoing document or the real theme of the Letter to the Romans.

1, 18-32. The Deep Moral Degeneracy of the Gentile World.

1, 18-20.

In contrast to the revelation of the righteousness of God in the Gospel the Apostle now speaks of a manifestation of the wrath of God over all the godlessness & unrighteousness of man. ἡ αποκάλυψις in v. 18 corresponds to the ἀποκάλυψις in v. 17, ὁ πῦρ forms the contrast to σωτηρία, and ἀσεβεία καὶ ἀδικία is the reverse of δικαιοσύνη. The connection of the statement in v. 18 with the foregoing, pointed out by the γὰρ, is mostly understood that faith is necessary, because without faith men have fallen under the wrath of God, or that the Gospel, which reveals the righteousness of faith, is necessary in order to save the world from wrath. Thus, for example, Meyer, Philippi, Hodet. But in v. 18 and the following nothing is said of the lack of faith, & in the preceding nothing is said of the necessity of faith or of the Gospel, but the fact is simply attested that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation, because it reveals the righteousness of faith. The reference, advocated by Weiss & Hofmann, of the γὰρ to v. 16 a: "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," appears rather forced, since the latter statement lies far back & has received a sufficient foundation already in v. 16, 17. The thought connection is designated most exactly by Fritzsch, when he writes: *Hic autem integer factus sempiternus beatus erit. Quique (ut contrarium exsequar) Dei ira... de coelo patet sit omneque, ut scitis, impiorum et improborum homines corrigit.* In v. 16, 17 the Apostle had asserted that his Gospel helps man to salvation, because it reveals the righteousness which avails before God, which therefore becomes

our own thro' faith, & has thereby stated that righteousness is the foundation & preliminary condition of salvation. He who has become righteous thro' faith shall receive life & salvation, as this is also attested by the statement of the Prophet Habakkuk. And even this latter truth is proven now in v. 15 and further in the contrary fact, thereby stated, that all godlessness & unrighteousness draws after itself the wrath of God. Thus also Luther's remarks on γὰρ in v. 18: "Now begins the proof of the preceding out of the reverse." "The wrath of God is the inner reaction of the divine holiness against sin as the ungodly thing." That is, first of all an agitation, which is shut up in the inwards of God, which, however, is then "revealed" & comes down as punishment, judgment & condemnation upon all godlessness & unrighteousness of man. ἡ εἰσὶν and ἡ δίκη have a certain relation to one another, as irreverence & immorality. The former is the personal misconduct against God, the latter is the denial & violation of the divine prerogative, the norm which God has set for the conduct of men. But when & how does God's wrath reveal & manifest itself over godless & unrighteous mankind? Men have here thought of a revelation of the divine wrath in the Gospel or in the Law or in the reason or conscience, or recalled the manifold evil & punishments of this time, or the fate into which God has given man according to v. 24 and v. 25. But all these interpretations do not agree with the solemn declaration: ἡ το καὶ ὑπερταῖ ὀργὴ θεοῦ. ἡ το ὀργασι. Disputes of all well to consider what Fritzche & Philippi remarks to ἡ το καὶ ὑπερταῖ. Refertur εἰς το καὶ ὑπερταῖ. ad res, quae extraordinario quodam Dei instituto hominibus imminereunt (Eph. 3, 5), discriminaturque ab humana institutione ἡ το καὶ ὑπερταῖ, h. e. Dei institutio, quae extraordinaria est et praeter naturae ordinem legemque, fit n. e. per angelum, per. communis, per spiritum s. afflatum. Gal. 1, 12; Eph. 3, 3. ἡ το καὶ ὑπερταῖ, to reveal something hidden, like the substantive ἡ το καὶ ὑπερταῖ in the N. T., when God is the revealing subject, always refers to an extraordinary revelation thro' a wonderful act. Therefore we cannot consider the manifestation of the wrath of God as mediated thro' natural means or events. But also not thro' the Gospel or the Word of Scripture in general. The addition ἡ το ὀργασι, "from heaven," speaks against that. Not the visible heaven is meant, but heaven as the residence of the omnipotent, majestic God. The God who dwells & is enthroned in heaven is the One who is over all the world, who there has power over the entire world. From thence, out of God's over-worldness the wrath of God reveals & pours itself out over all godlessness & unrighteousness of men, over the entire godless & unrighteous generation of man, so that not a single man can escape it. When one reads & considers this, does not there then come to mind the great, solemn, singular, majestic revelation of the wrath of God on the last day, on the day of judgment? That was the impression which also the ancient Greek church teachers received from these words of Paul's to which

44.
1, 18-20.

among the more recent, for example, Ewald, Philippi & Ritschl, have given room. The present ἀποκαλύπτειται does not stand in the way of this conception. The N. T. also otherwise speaks of the final judgment in the present, as a certain, doubtless, fact. Cf. Rom. 2, 2: οἱ δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοῖς, etc. 11 Thess. 1, 8: ἐν ὑπὲρ φλογὸς διδόντος ἐκ δίκης οὖν. 1 Pet. 1, 12: τὸν ἀπροσώπων κρίνοντα, etc. Similarly it says of the Antichrist, which should still be revealed: οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία, etc. 11 Thess. 2, 9. And now one still adds that Paul, the Scriptures in general, also otherwise with the same expression as we find here, describes the great catastrophe of the Last Day. On that day the Son of man shall be revealed, Luke 17, 30; also here the present ἀποκαλύπτειται. From heaven we look for the Saviour Jesus Christ. Phil. 3, 20: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven." 1 Thess. 4, 16: "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; & to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that knew not God." 11 Thess. 1, 6ff. Likewise what the Apostle says further below in his letter concerning the wrath of God, 2, 2: "And thinkest thou this, O man, ... that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" 2, 5: "After thy hardness & impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath & revelation, ἀποκαλύψεως, of the righteous judgment of God", are parallel to 1, 18. The meaning of Paul is that even the men who judge others experience the same fate as the others, shall fall under the same wrath, which shall be revealed upon all godless, unrighteous men.

The godless & unrighteous men are still more closely characterized by the addition τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδίκῃ κατέχοντων, as such who hold down the truth thru unrighteousness. The verb κατέχειν is not used here in the meaning "festhalten", hold firmly, but in the other meaning, "aufhalten", arrest, "niederhalten", hold down, "hindern", hinder, as, for example, also in 11 Thess. 2, 7. Man possesses the truth. The truth also contains the norm for the correct conduct of men. And the truth penetrates into them, urges & obligates them to a conduct which is agreeable to God. But they oppose the truth, hold it down, suppress it, so that with them it does not come to its prerogative. Veritas nititur in mente et urget, sed homo impedit eam. Bengel. And certainly thru unrighteousness. Men serve unrighteousness - the ἀδίκη here at the same time includes the ἀσέβεια itself - they do the reverse of the truth, & thus they hinder the same, hinder its effect, so that it does not strike roots in their hearts, does not succeed in their life & conduct, does not become of worth. Thus this addition indicates the severe guilt of man. Their godlessness and unrighteousness does not come from ignorance, but is an inexcusable wrong-doing, which opposes their own better knowledge, & therefore they shall correctly be fallen upon by the wrath of God. But what is meant by the truth, which men hold down, the following statement in v. 19

45.
11820.

shows: $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$ τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ παρεπὶ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνεψε.

"Denn was von Gott erkennbar ist, ist kund in ihnen; denn Gott hat es ihnen kund-
gethan" ("because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it
unto them"). Many commentators find herein a further description of the guilt of mankind & a
further basic description for the revelation of the wrath of God. But then one must add a
thought such as this, that men do not grant results to that which is manifested to them, as, for
example, Hofmann also does, & thereof the text says nothing. Therefore we take $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$, a
strengthened $\delta\tau\iota$, here similarly as $\delta\tau\iota$ in 1 Cor. 1, 25, in the explicative sense; the sentence
introduced thereby serves for the explanation of the concept τὸ γινώσκον, v. 18. Sutherland:
" $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$, for the explanation of that original possession of the truth, therefore closely
belonging to the foregoing." τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ we translate with the ancient
expositors, & among the recent ones, Weiss, Hofmann, Godet: "das, was von Gott
erkennbar ist" (H. G.: "that which may be known of God"; & thus we take γνωστὸς in the
meaning customary in profane Greek. The other meaning, which the word has otherwise
in the New Testament, "bekannt," known, would present a pure tautology in our passage:

What is known of God is manifest to them. That is thus the truth which the Apostle
here has in mind: that which may be known of God is made known to all men, also to
natural man, or God Himself, insofar as He is capable of being known. And this is mani-
fest to them, in the hearts of men; for God Himself has manifested it to them, in that He
has written into their hearts the knowledge of Himself, a *notitia Dei*. It is well to
consider that this natural revelation of God is designated with the expressions
παρεπὶ and ἐφάνεψε, not with ἀποκαλύπτειν.

The following sentence, v. 21, introduced with γὰρ, serves again for the clarification
of the foregoing statement. Every revelation of God & all knowledge of God, which has
been imparted to all men, is mediated thru the works of creation. The Apostle speaks here
of the invisible essence of God, τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ, in that with the plural he points to the
diversity of the divine essence, & emphasizes: τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁρατά, "God's invisible
essence shall be seen, looked upon; καὶ ὁρατά is only a strengthened ὅρασις. That is
certainly an "Apy-moron", which finds its explanation in the participle modifier ἀπὸ

κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοοῦμεν αὐτόν. The invisible God shall be seen, in
that He is observed since the creation of the world in the works of creation. The expression ἀπὸ
κτίσεως κόσμου is a designation of time, like ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς, κτίσεως, Mark 10, 6; 13, 19; 1 Pet. 3, 4,
and ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Matt. 25, 34. The verb νοοῦμεν denotes an activity of the νοῦς, the
reason, a mental perception, an inner observation. The invisible essence of God is perceived

46.
1, 18-20.

inwardly, but insofar as this mental perception is mediated thru the visible things of this world, one can also say, that the invisible is seen. Since the world was created, man has before his eyes the permanency of the world, the works of creation, in that he has viewed, contemplated the same, he becomes aware of what lies on that side of the visible world, but what likewise has impressed its traces in the visible world, even the invisible essence of God. It is particularly a twofold thing of which one becomes aware in this manner, concerning the invisible God. First, His eternal power, $\eta \alpha \iota \delta \iota \varsigma \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \upsilon \nu \alpha \mu \iota \varsigma$; $\alpha \iota \delta \varsigma$ from $\alpha \epsilon \iota$, enduring always. When one observes the great, magnificent world, then this is the first & foremost impression which one receives, that there is one God, who is exalted over world & time, & that the eternal God has created the ends of the earth. Cf. Isa. 40, 28. The completed work, $\pi \omicron \iota \eta \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$, points back to the upper causality: the work praises its master. "The heavens declare the glory of God; & the firmament sheweth his handiwork," preaches thereof, that the hand of the Almighty has prepared them. But on the other hand & in general the visible world gives testimony of the $\theta \epsilon \iota \omicron \tau \eta \varsigma$ of God, that is, of His divinity. $\theta \epsilon \iota \omicron \tau \eta \varsigma$ means divinity, which is to be God, $\theta \epsilon \iota \omicron \tau \eta \varsigma$ points to the divine nature & therefore above all to the incomparable greatness & majesty of God, magnificentia Dei, $\mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \epsilon \iota \omicron \tau \eta \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$. Luke 9, 43. The concept $\theta \epsilon \iota \omicron \tau \eta \varsigma$ is more general, more comprehensive than the first, $\eta \alpha \iota \delta \iota \varsigma \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \upsilon \nu \alpha \mu \iota \varsigma$; $\theta \epsilon \iota \omicron \tau \eta \varsigma$ is the epitome of divine perfection. Under even now this visible world, the splendor, the fulness, the riches, the beauty of the creatures is a kind of reflection of the $\epsilon \varsigma \varsigma \alpha$, of the majestas of the invisible God, as then the usefulness of all created things, & that all things serve mankind, points in particular to God's wisdom & goodness. Of the declarations of opinions of ancient heathen in the many commentaries, presented as evidence of the content of our verse, we mention here only the following. Aristotle's de mundo, c. 6: $\pi \alpha \nu \theta \nu \eta \tau \eta \rho \theta \upsilon \sigma \epsilon \iota \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \omicron \varsigma \alpha \delta \epsilon \epsilon \upsilon \rho \eta \tau \alpha \varsigma \alpha \nu \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \pi \gamma \mu \alpha \nu \theta \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \circ \theta \epsilon \varsigma$, libro de divina natura, II, 72: cuncta prospectantem aliquam aeternamque naturam et eam suspiciendam admirandamque hominum generis, pulchritudo mundi ordoque rerum coelestium cogit confiteri. The naturalistic world-philosophy, according to which the world is supposed to have come forth of itself or to have existed eternally, according to which nature is supposed to have provided itself so richly & beautifully, is not only unscriptural but also unreasonable.

With this natural revelation of God, however, it is aimed at taking away from mankind all excuse: $\epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha \iota \alpha \nu \tau \omega \varsigma \alpha \nu \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \eta \tau \omega \nu$, "auf dass sie keine Entschuldigung haben" ("so that they are without excuse"). With the $\epsilon \iota \varsigma$ only the purpose can be given, not the mere result. God has given Himself to man to be known in the works of creation, & with that has given them the impulse to place themselves over against Him as it becomes the creature. This

truth, which is God himself, the invisible essence of God, which reflected itself in the visible world, is an inalienable possession of mankind. But even this truth men suppress & stifle thru unwrighteousness, & certainly mankind in general. All men are likewise perverted & sin from their mother's womb. All mankind, as it is by nature since the fall into sin, the apostle here has in mind. And so mankind can present nothing for their excuse, when God shall enter into judgment with them over their godlessness & unwrighteousness. And God had even aimed at that fact that men should allege nothing, on the day of judgment which could serve for their excuse, that they could not ascribe to the fact that they had not known better. It is basically wrong when modern theologians present the revelatio divina naturalis and the notitia Dei naturalis as a kind of means of grace, which at least brings a few men to God or nearer to God. That contradicts the purpose of the natural revelation of God as presented here by the apostle. Only those men who are converted to God thru another means, thru the Word, who have recognized God from His Word, then also really make this natural revelation of God & knowledge of God useful to themselves & give this fragment of truth life & room in their hearts, conduct & life.

1, 21-23.

After the apostle had shown in vv. 19, 20 wherein the truth in v. 18 consists, he now carries further how men hold down the truth & establish thereby that they are inexcusable & are fallen under the wrath of God. The ἵνα, "idem" for v. 21, refers back to the immediately preceding, so that they are without cause. The participle clause γινώσκοντες τὸν θεόν, we translate: "nachdem" or "obgleich sie Gott erkannt hatten" (Ps.: "because that, when they knew God"). For the knowledge of God appears here as the prima, which goes before the conduct of man characterized in the following verbum finitum. Still that is not to be understood thus: as if men had then lost this knowledge. The truth is regarded as a present, continuing possession of man, as a possession of man of all times. It reads previously: "that which may be known of God is manifest in them", φανερὸν ἐστὶν. All men, who have the works of the creation before their eyes, perceive from that also the invisible essence of God. Even the most depraved Gentiles know or still consider something of the fact that there is a God & what there is about God. "Der Polytheismus trüglin seiner über sich und in seinem Hintergrund stehenden, fortwährend auftauchenden und fortwährend niedergehenden Idee des Einen wahren Gottes sein eigenes Gerücht in sich selber." (Chilippi). But now, all the men have known God, still they have not praised & thanked Him as God. They have not permitted their conduct to be determined by such knowledge. "This revelation has not passed over from the passive form into the active." "God's." This knowledge from the revelation of nature they have obtained, but only

actu directo, insofar as they have given themselves to recognize the self-revelation of God objectively, the actus reflexus remains outside & it does not come to the praise of God. "Meyer. 8^t" becomes them, the truth urges them to honor & praise God as the Creator of all things & to thank Him as the giver of all good & perfect gifts. But that they have not done & therefore suppressed the truth, the better knowledge. The coriata οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς ἔδδ' ἔα βαν. ἦ-ἡνυα πῶς τῶν, as well as the following coriata, point back to the beginning of this evil conduct of theirs. But thus they have always done, & thus they still do, therefore the present expressions κατεχόντων, v. 18, and τοιοῦτων, v. 32.

With the ἀδία in v. 21 b the opposite to the praise & thanks, which they have refused God, is introduced: "condemnis sind eitel geworden in ihren Gedanken" ("but became vain in their imaginations"). ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν. There is described first of all the mental-moral condition into which they had thereby fallen, that they turned themselves from the living God. With the passive expressions ἐματαιώθησαν, ἐκατότε θῆκαν, ἐματαιώθησαν this condition is designated as a fate which has befallen them, while on the other hand in their own guilt that they cherish & protect such vain, foolish thoughts. They have become vain, empty in their thoughts, in that they have turned them to vain, empty, perishable things. With this sense & thoughts they have destroyed & lost themselves in the created things, & from God the Creator, the "wahre Realität," every creature is detached as αὐταίον. It is still to be considered that the expression διαλογισμοί is used in the N. T. only in the malo sensu, as, for example, Matt. 15, 19; Luke 5, 22; 24, 38, as well as that αὐταίον, αὐταίον ὁ θεός, laque diabolici idoli & corumque cultu et cultoribus, 1 Kings 12, 15; Jer. 4, 5. Bengel: "Und ihr unverständiges Herz ist verfinstert worden" ("and their foolish heart was darkened"). ἦ τοῦ ὕψους, καὶ δια is a moral concept. As a βούλιος, cf. Matt. 13, 23; Rom. 3, 11, is one who permits himself to be instructed & spoken to, αὐβόλιος is one who has no intelligence, who embraces no understanding. Men have shut their heart, their inwards to the light, which penetrates into them, have granted no influence on their moral thoughts, feelings, & desires, & thus this has darkened their foolish heart. This darkening is only an involution of the natural ignorance & blindness, Eph. 4, 18. The two-fold fact, that they have known God & still know Him, on the other hand, that they are completely darkened, agree well with one another. Out of the works of creation streams of light have fallen into their heart; they know something concerning God & cannot withdraw themselves from this knowledge, but this light, this knowledge does not have the slightest effect upon their moral selves, on the agitations of their thoughts, the turns of their will, in that they continually hinder these effects. What they on their part think, conclude, judge concerning God & divine things is all wrong & perverted, as they also have not the slightest desire & inclination to give to God.

what is God's; there is in them no spark of spiritual light. The Apostle himself explains in the figurative speech concerning the darkening of their hearts, in that he adds in v. 22 that they, in that they have presumed themselves to be wise, have become fools. With the darkening & foolishness, darkening of wisdom also appears. Weiss here very aptly draws attention to the fact "that the true wisdom, which stems from divine revelation, remains humbly conscious of its origin, while, even where the real constituent parts of wisdom are lacking, the darkness appears on the self-conceived wisdom."

The final, disastrous result & product of this vain mind, the darkening & foolishness of men, however, was that they "die 7. irdlichkeit des unvergänglichen Gottes vertauscht haben mit einem bleichem, dem Bild von einem vergänglichen Menschen und von Vögeln und vierfüssigen und kriechenden Thieren" ("changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, & to birds, & fourfooted beasts, & creeping things"). v. 23. In this sentence, which joins itself not grammatically but logically to the *ἀνίστα* in v. 21, there comes to a climax the reverse of the praise & thanks which men really owe to God. The epitome of the section v. 21-23 is: οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξαζον ἢ ἡν ἡ δόξα τῆς αἰωνίου ἀπαύρατος τοῦ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιωματι εἰκόνοσ φερατοῦ ἀνθρώπου etc. Instead of the true, living God men have a self-conceived god,

instead of to the Creator they have given the honor to the creature. Before the Apostle manifests the idolatry, he had previously only described the moral frame of mind out of which this horrible perversion of the truth had come. For the most part men have perverted the words *ἡ δόξα ἐν ὁμοιωματι εἰκόνοσ*, etc. to the fact that men have confounded the glory of God with the likeness of an image or with something that is like or similar to the image of a man or an animal. But then one of the two words, *ὁμοιωμα* or *εἰκὼς*, would be superfluous, to which also Weiss draws our attention; whatever is like an image is even itself an image. We take *ὁμοιωμα* concretely, as it is used as a rule, as a thing which is similar to another, and *εἰκόνοσ* as genitive of apposition. The similitude with which one confounds God consists in an image of a man or an animal. Men have confounded the glory of the incorruptible God, the creative glory of God, which was also capable of being known by them, with the image of a corruptible man or even of an irrational animal. Such an image was supposed to be a similitude, an image of the divinity.

In their vain, dark & foolish thoughts men have changed God, of whom they still had an idea, into a creature, have altered the various divine attributes, of which the divine *δόξα* consists, into human or animal characteristics & assigned them to various gods; they conceived of God as a mortal human being or even as an animal essence & honored him.

50.
1, 24-27.

therefore under the form, in the image of a man or an animal, in that they finally idolized this image itself. The double designation of the idol worship recalls the human cultus of the Greeks & Romans, as well as the animal cultus of the Egyptians. At the same time the description given here of the heathen idolatry presents itself as a reminiscence of Ps. 136, 23, where it is said that "they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass." Deut. 4, 15 ff. is an exact parallel to our passage. There the children of Israel are called to remember that in the day when God spoke with them out of the fire from Mt. Horeb, they had seen no form, אין שום דבר, of God, therefore they should not corrupt themselves, not change God into the reverse & prepare for themselves any graven image of a man or woman, or animal, or bird, or creeping thing, or fish; thus they should not worship any image of man or animal as a form or similitude of God. Well to be considered yet is what Philippi remarks to our verse: "Es könnte also in unserm Vers zugleich angedeutet sein oder darf doch an sich hier bemerkt werden, wie der Monarch in der Thorheit des naturwidrigen Götzendienstes alle ursprüngliche, gottgegebene Ordnung umgekehrt habe, indem er selbst nach dem Bilde Gottes geschaffen wurde, doch nach seinem Bilde umschuf, und am Heron der Thierwelt eingesetzt sich zu ihrem anbetenden Knechte herabwürdigte." What the apostle here declares regarding the most horrible form of idolatry, the image cultus, self-evidently concerns also all finer forms of idolatry, such as the veneration of the sun, moon, & stars, or that of the powers of nature, concerns also the deification of the creature, as it is current in the present-day, so-called Christians world.

Now in a short, powerful statement the apostle has characterized the ἀσέβεια, the godlessness of men, & has shown how men thru ungodliness suppress the truths. Now in the following he turns to the presentation of the other basic wrong the ἀεὶ καὶ, the unrighteousness.

1, 24-27

Here, in vv. 24-27, the apostle brings forth the other basic evil & vice of the Gentiles, the ἀκαθαρσία, uncleanness, here specially as in 11 Cor. 12, 21; Gal. 5, 9, all sorts of sexual lewdness, "wollüstige Unflätherci", "lewd filthiness". The same belongs in the genus of ἀδικία. But he does not coordinate the ἀκαθαρσία of the previously pictured ἀσέβεια, but expresses himself thus: "Ἐποὺν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπέδωκεν ἡ ἀκαθαρσία" ("wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness"). Διὸ καὶ ἡ ἀκαθαρσία αὐτοῖς ὁδοῖς εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν. Therefore, because of their godlessness & idolatry, God, suitable to this conduct of theirs, has also delivered men to uncleanness. Uncleanness here appears as a

punishment of godlessness & as a divine destiny, God punishes sin with sin. Of this the world also has some presentiment. "That is the curse of the evil deed, that it must produce continued evil." To the $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ & $\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ Labor remarks: *Traditio sunt a deo non effectiva, nec solum permittens, nec tantum. $\epsilon\kappa$ $\delta\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$, sed $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\omega\varsigma$ et judicialiter.* Be true as this be, still the $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ is not sufficiently explained by that. The concept of punishment & the judgment already lies in the $\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$. The question is: Which special judgment of punishment, which special act of God is meant by the giving them up to uncleanness, a question concerning which one finds little information in the commentaries. When, for example, Hofmann & Meyer thereby explain this expression, that God permits the inner connection between sin & punishment to come to reality, to accomplish itself fully, then nothing is really said with that; when, on the other hand, Luthardt advances the opinion that God works this special form of sin, then thereby too much is said, in that God especially works no evil. In order to understand the meaning of the *apostle*, we must above all draw into consideration the modifier $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\omega\nu$ $\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu$. "Bei" or "in den Begierden ihres Herzens" ("thru the lusts of their own hearts"), in which they were engrossed, which they cherished & protected; God had given the Gentiles into uncleanness, into all the works of the flesh, in which the evil desires became deeds. Philippi remarks correctly: "The concluding & nourishing of the sinful desires in their hearts, which had been established with the falling away from God & the 'abgöttischen Hingebens' in the creature of itself, is thus presented as their own act; on the other hand, the outbreak of these desires into disgraceful depravity as a divine arrangement, as a divine judgment of punishment." But then wherein does this divine arrangement consist? First of all, God still has His work in fallen man, God also still holds sinful man with His Spirit at least outwardly in discipline & bounds, instills in them fear & terror of sin; God warns one, who hatches up evil plans, against the actual sin, as He warned Cain before he became a murderer, admonishes the conscience, lays all sorts of hindrances in the way of the evil intentions, & thus seeks to check the outbreaks or still the most horrible outbreaks of the evil desires of the heart. But when man despises all these divine admonitions & the godlessness increases, then God takes away His Spirit, then God withdraws all these bounds & hindrances, & gives up, delivers the godless man completely over to sin, so that nothing any longer stands in the way of the satisfaction of his desires. And so, in this sense, God has abandoned the Gentiles to uncleanness as punishment for their godlessness, so that now without any restraint, boldly & unimpeded, they satisfy their evil lust, so that the evil desires of their hearts work themselves out unchecked in every possible uncleanness and unchastity. "He has positively withdrawn His hand; He has ceased holding back the boat,

which is carried away by the stream." Godet. Ancient commentators, like Chrysostom & Theophylact, clarify the matter which is dealt with here by the example of a captain who deserts his soldiers in battle & thereby abandons them to the enemy, or of a physician, who gives up a disobedient patient & has nothing more to do with him. That which the Apostle attests here does not contradict what he writes in Eph. 4:19, namely, that the Gentiles have given themselves over to lasciviousness, for the exercising of all uncleanness, ἐκ τῶν παρ' ἐσώκων. That the Gentiles have surrendered themselves willingly to the service of uncleanness does not exclude the fact that God has given them into the same. God has delivered them over to their own perverted mind & will. Moreover, that which Paul describes in this place regarding the destiny which has befallen the Gentiles, even if it calls to mind the description of his obduracy in Rom. 9-11, still is something entirely different from the real judgment of obduracy; for the latter befalls the unbelievers, who have not been obedient to the Gospel of Christ, while here it deals in the context with the opposition over against the natural revelation of God, which does not exclude the later revelation of God in the Gospel.

The infinitive clause τοῦ ἀτιμᾶσθαι etc., added to the principle clause αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ἐς ἀκαθαρσίαν, does not serve as a modifier of the expression ἐς ἀκαθαρσίαν, for that is a self-evident concept, which needs no supplement; but it gives the purpose of this act of God. The correct reading, also adopted by Hofmann & Weiss, can be τοῦ ἀτιμᾶσθαι τοὺς βίμωτα αὐτῶν. ἐν αὐτοῖς, not ἐν ἐκ τῶν, the latter especially not in the meaning of ἀνδράσιν, which ἐν ἐκ τῶν does not signify, also in v. 27. This is to be translated thus: "and cause their *Leiber* an ihnen selbst geschändet werden" (H.V.: "to dishonor their own bodies between themselves"). Ἀτιμᾶσθαι, which is never used in the middle, fits here as a passive. Thus the vice of unchastity the bodies of men are dishonored, shamed. And certainly in themselves, ἐν αὐτοῖς, like αὐτῶν, refers to the persons who are under discussion. The body appears here, as in 1 Thes. 4:4, as something which has the man, the human in itself. With this body the man himself is shamed, the unchastity takes away from him all the honor which he has as a creature of God. And even at this had God aimed, when He gave men over to uncleanness. Because of their godlessness He would punish them even by this, that He abandoned their bodies to shame & robbed them of their created honor.

In v. 25 the Apostle returns to the motive, which determined the action of God mentioned in v. 24, in that he continues: "als welche die Wahrheit lieber vertauscht haben mit der Lüge" ("who changed the truth of God into a lie"). The relative pronoun, οἱ τ. 25, qui, qui contains a basic declaration. After the "Neque" between godlessness & uncleanness had already been shown in v. 24 with εἰς ἡμᾶς, now the congruence between sin & punishment is

brought out. Ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ is, as ἡ ἀλήθεια in 1. 8, the truth which is God Himself, the true God, 1 Thess. 1. 9; τὸ θεῖον designates τὸς θεὸς, Θεός, as also in the Hebrew 7. p. 5, the lie serves for the designation of the idols. Isa. 44. 20; Jer. 2. 10, 13, 25. Men have confounded the true living God with the idols, which in a false manner are called gods. Pro-
 nuntio deo summus imaginario. Virtute. And "sie haben das beschaffen, was nicht und ihm
 gleich ist, dass sie ihn" ("worshipped & served the creature more than the Creator"). The
 εὐσεβὲς ὁρῶν concerns the inward veneration in the service, the εὐσεβὲς ὁρῶν points to the
 outward service, cultus, & sacrifice. The poor foolish men turn their whole heart & all their
 powers to their idols. The creature, the κτίσις, they serve τὰ κτίσις, τὰ κτίσις, τὰ κτίσις, as in
 Luke 8. 11, in the exclusive sense, præterito or neglecto creatori, passing by the Creator. The
 creature they honor & not the Creator - who alone deserves praise, honor, & veneration, "der
 da gepriesen ist in Ewigkeit. Amen" ("who is blessed forever. Amen"). Thus the apostle cries
 out in holy exultation of spirit, in that he enters into the lists for the honor of his God & Creator.
 Idolatry, deification of a creature is an abomination over which all righteous Christians,
 who know, fear & love God, correctly become angry & enraged. Thus men have also shamed
 God, in that they have degraded Him to a creature, & that avenge itself now by the fact
 that according to the destiny of God they shame themselves, their own bodies. Whoever takes
 away the due honor from God, the Creator, loses & destroys thereby his own honor, his human
 honor, & sinks down to (the level of) an animal.

The following sentence in 11. 20. 27 runs parallel to 11. 24. 25. It reads again in 12. 6: "Denn
 bat sie Gott dahingegeben" ("For this cause God gave them up", namely, because of their idolatry,
 which had been made manifest again in 11. 25. Still instead of εἰς ἀνάσσειν, the apostle now
 uses a stronger expression, namely, εἰς τὸ ὄν ἁγνίσαι. Into horrible passions, which en-
 slaved & ruled them, God had given them. And what kind of passions are meant is explain-
 ed in the following, 11. 26. 27. After the apostle had previously spoken in general of the vice
 of unchastity, he now names a special species of the same, the most horrible, offensive
 form of sensual uncleanness, as it was prevalent at his time even in the Roman world.
 Their women, who are according to their nature designated as τῆς φύσεως, have exchanged the
 natural use of their nature with an unnatural one, in that women commit prostitution with
 women. In like manner, however, even the men - οἱ ἀνδρες is likewise a desig-
 nation of nature - have left the natural use of the women, have burned in their desire
 over against one another & men commit on men the known shame, τῆς ἀνδρῶν πορνείας.
 Men & women have denied the natural relationship of the two natures to one another,
 which had been established by the creation upon which the continuation of the human

race depended, & turned the act corresponding to that into an unnatural act. Fleshly lusts, when they have free rein, finally degenerate into the grossest monstrosities. With such unnatural lewdness, under which they were enslaved, men only received the due reward, which comes to them according to God's righteous recompense, $\tau\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \mu\epsilon\ \theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$. This is the corresponding punishment for their error, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\eta$, that they have wandered away from God to the idols. Such perversion of the truth avenges itself on them. The service of idols, as it is portrayed in 1,25, is not only a desecration of God, but also a horrible monstrosity. The boundary between Creator & creature is completely deranged, when the honor is taken away from the Creator, & placed upon the creature. Under such unnaturalness in the religious phase there follows, according to God's destiny, unnaturalness in the moral phase, so that the creative difference between man & woman, which concerns the natural use, is completely done away with, so that man & woman are likewise completely divested of their nature.

With $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in 1,28 the Epistle introduces a new guilt of men, which again at the same time appears as a punishment inflicted upon them by God. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\epsilon\ \epsilon\sigma\kappa\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\upsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\ \nu\ \kappa\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ means "prüfen, prove, test, try, & then, as here & otherwise, e.g. 1 Thess. 2,4, "würdigen, rücksicht nehmen, "würdigen, consider worthy. Which corresponds to $\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$, from $\delta\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, "nicht annehmbar, not acceptable, "nerwerflich, objectionable, "nich würdig, worthless, contemptible. Cf. 1 Cor. 9,27. $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is as much as "Sinn, mind, "Besinnung, conviction; it designates first of all the inner ability, "that by virtue of which man thinks & decides of himself, the thinking & willing in himself is his $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, "Weltanschauung, but then also, as here & for example, in 1 Cor. 1,10; 2,16, the concrete thinking & willing as a possession, a determined turn of the thinking & willing, the condition of the mind, conviction. Thus men have not considered God as ^{worthy of} having Him in their knowledge, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\upsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$. God had given Himself to be known by them, they have known God, but it did not come to an inner possession of their knowledge; they have not made this knowledge their own subjectively, have not put it to use, have not considered it worth the trouble. And to this sin the punishment now corresponds. The same as they have not considered God worthy to be had in knowledge, the same as they have rejected God & the knowledge of God, so has God given them over to a worthless, objectionable mind, so that they now freely & unimpeded conform to this perverted conviction, so that

as the epexegetical infinitive clause $\piοεῖν τὰ μὴ κατ' ἰκοντα$ states, they now do what is not $\muὴ$ becoming according to their own judgment. With the knowledge of God there is also planted in the heart of man by nature a knowledge of good & evil; but also this moral knowledge men deny with their convictions & with their activity.

But as the following shows, the apostle has in mind here a special form of guilt. There follow in vv. 29-31 pure accusatives of participles, substantives, & adjectives, which join themselves to the subject, which adds to the $\piοεῖν$ in v. 28, thus to $\alphaὐτοῖς$. Paul describes the persons who do that which is not fitting & certain even so, that he characterizes them according to their objectionable mind & activity. The common fact in the transgressions enumerated in the following indeclinables is that thereby the neighbor is shamed, the love of the neighbor is abandoned. We can differentiate four groups of modifiers of $\alphaὐτοῖς$. The first two groups are introduced by $τὴν ἡγομένην$ and $μετὰ$. Men are full of every evil, there are not only isolated mistakes & vices, which adhere to them from the top of their head to their feet, there is nothing whole in them. Philippi correctly recalls the dictum of Seneca, *de ira*, II, 8, with which he begins

the description of the moral depravity of his time: *Omnia sceleribus ac vitiis plena sunt*. The first series we read with Sachmann according to good authorities: $\piεπηρωμένους$ $πῆρ ᾧδικία$, $κακία$, $πονηρία$, $πλεονεξία$. The reading $πορνεία$, "fornication, which positively does not fit in this connection, is ungenuine in any case & really written as a mistake from $πονηρία$. Men are filled with all kinds of unrighteousness. $\mathcal{A}\delta\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$, here in the narrow sense infraction of the rights of the neighbor, denial of righteousness, which one owes to a neighbor *quum cuique*, includes under it all the separate transgressions mentioned in the following. But as the two substantives immediately following, $κακία$ and $πονηρία$, are still general concepts. We translate $κακός$ and $πονηρός$ into German somewhat with "böse" and "schlecht". Much has been written & conjectured concerning the differentiation of these two designations. Still the idiom of the N.T., as Weiss correctly calls our attention to the fact, suggests no certain difference. Only the following consideration ^{can} be that which will stand the test. $κακός$ is the nearest contrast to $\alphaἰσχος$ or $κακός$, $κακία$ is the opposite of $\alphaρετή$; $πονηρός$, $πονηρία$ is the designation of the most intense wickedness.

There are the evils always called $\delta\ \piονηρός$. In the sense of moral wickedness and depravity in general $κακία$ and $πονηρία$ are bound together with one another in 1 Cor. 5:8. However, both concepts also specially designate the evil, wicked dispositions over against the neighbor; thus $κακία$, Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8; 1 Th. 3:3; 1 Pet. 2:1; James 1:11; $πονηρία$, Mark 7:22; Luke 11:39; Matt. 22:18. And in this latter meaning both find themselves together in our passage; we have

late nearly, in that we maintain a gradation, "Bochheit" (A. L.: "wickedness"), and "Bochheitig-keit," malice, or "arglist," deceit. The $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha$, "Habacht," "covetousness, which inconsiderately seeks its own advantage, to the disadvantage of the neighbor, appears also otherwise, for example, Eph. 5, 3; 1 Thess. 4, 3-5, together with the $\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\delta\alpha$ as a basic vice of the Gentiles. In the second series there now follow special vices, individual demonstrations of unrighteousness & wickedness, & certainly such which flow from avarice, covetousness: $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma, \phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma, \phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma, \epsilon\pi\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma, \delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma, \kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\gamma\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, "voll Neid, Mord, Hader, List, Tücke" ("full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity"). Envy does not grant to another his own & often leads to the point that one puts him aside; or, if it does not come that far, then one begins debate & strife with him over what is one's or the other's, or strives with deceit and malignity, in an indirect way, to do him injury. $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\gamma\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ means really malum per-neritae, "schlechter Charakter," then especially malignity, malicious nature. The second series of transgressions against the second Table of the Law begins with the words, $\psi\iota\sigma\upsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma, \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, "zischern," "whisperers," "Drehräcker," "tell-tale," & "Verkümder," "slanderer." Men harm one another not only in body & life, property & goods, but also in their reputation. Closely bound together with one another are the three nouns $\epsilon\upsilon\beta\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma, \epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\omicron\varsigma, \alpha\lambda\alpha\varsigma\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$. The $\epsilon\upsilon\beta\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is a wicked person, who in his arrogance treats his neighbor disgracefully, mean; the $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\omicron\varsigma$ is one who raises himself above all others & looks down disdainfully upon all others; the $\alpha\lambda\alpha\varsigma\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$, vaniloquus, gloriosus, is one who makes a parade of his own imaginary merits & deeds & will have nothing to do with another one. Such despising of one's fellowman, as if he were not our equal, such degradation of his person, is the most shameful thing that one can do to him. And such pride is an especial abomination before God. Therefore the apostle here especially draws attention to the fact that people of this stamp are hateful to God. For $\theta\epsilon\omicron\phi\tau\upsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, which has only a passive designation, cannot mean osorae Dei, is unavoidable to take a self-evident position in this independence & therefore to bind it as a preceding attribute with the following expressions. Men are transgressors, who are hateful to God & wicked, etc. And finally Paul calls them $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma, \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$. They are inventive, designing in evil, they always devise new tricks & malignities, to do injury to their fellowmen, which one cannot fully enumerate. A fourth series contains adjectives beginning with a privativum, thus describing still the objectionable disposition and the immoral action of men from the negative side. These are disobedient to parents, $\alpha\delta\omicron\upsilon\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota$, imprudent, will not let themselves be told anything, $\alpha\delta\omicron\nu\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota$, unsovereign, $\alpha\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\gamma\iota$, loveless, suppress all natural affections of love, $\alpha\epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\varsigma$, unmerciful, insensible to the needs of their fellowmen; in short, they deny all reverence, all human feeling & sympathy, have become

true monsters. Und eben darum, weil sie Gott nicht haben ehren. Gott sein lassen. Only where one has God in knowledge, only where one fears & loves God, does one find true humanitarianism.

That God has given men into a contemptible, objectionable mind is proven by the special fact, which is introduced in v. 32 with οἴτινες, and is joined with the foregoing description of morals. Men have known the legal demand, the legal statement of God, τὸ. Σί. κ. ἰ. μ. μ. τοῦ Θεοῦ. With the knowledge of God at the same time that which is right according to God's will & designation for the conduct of men over against one another is to be inscribed in the heart. As God is righteous, just & merciful over against men, His creature, as should men show, righteousness & love over against their equals. That they know very well, ἐμὴν νό. υ. τ. ε. s, and know also that "die bö. t. t. e. r. l. i. c. h. e. n. d. e. r. H. o. d. e. s. w. ü. r. d. i. g. s. i. n. d." ("they which commit such things are worthy of death"), that all who perform the previously mentioned evil works are not worthy of living. Because they destroy the peaceful living together of men with their evil activity, & put an end to the continuation of the human race, as much as is in them, therefore they have no right of existence upon earth. Such knowledge manifests itself in the heathen myth, concerning the vengeance of the gods, who suddenly snatch away the children, or concerning the punishment of the evil in Hades.

The Apostle transposes the confused heathen ideas into the adequate truth, in that he speaks of death, the temporal death, which, however, for sinful man is only the gateway to eternal death. No wonder here with Hofmann the punishment of death to be executed by the majesty lies entirely out of the way. But now even the men know that they still do the opposite to that which is right, & not only that, but - and this is an intensification - they give approval, οὐ. υ. ε. υ. σ. κ. ο. ῶ. σ. i, to those who carry on these evil things likewise as their trade, τοῖς ἡ. π. ῶ. σ. ο. υ. σ. i, and thereby show their pleasure in things which according to their own judgment are transgressions worthy of death. Very correctly several commentators here refer to the theoretical support of "Päderastie" (pederasty), revengefulness, & other vices in the writings of ancient heathen philosophers. Rejus est οὐ. υ. ε. υ. σ. ο. κ. ε. ῖ. v. nam qui malum patrat, sua sibi cupiditate abducitur etc; sed qui οὐ. υ. ε. υ. σ. ο. κ. ε. ῖ, corde et ore, malitiae fructum habet ipsam malitiam, eoque facitur, et suum ratum alieno cumulat aliosque in seccando inflammant. Rejus est, qui et se et alios, quam qui se unum perimit. Bengel.

The Apostle has carried thru from all points the theme of the section, vi. 18-32, which had been introduced in v. 18. He had pointed to the three basic wrongs of humanity, of heathenism. Men have robbed God of His glory & placed it upon the creatures. They serve uncleanliness & unchastity, shame their own & one another's bodies, in that they pervert the natural relationship of man to woman. They refuse all righteousness & love over against their fellowmen. And certainly the two latter transgressions, which include themselves under the concept ἑ. ἑ. ἑ. ἑ. i. s in the

wider sense, are the result & punishment of the first concert, & it is a lesson that they may see the truth thru godlessness & unrighteousness, which has become manifest to them. They are inescapable & the children of wrath. But it is well to consider that in this manner the Apostle does not only portray barbarism, no, he describes here even the world which he has before his eyes, the Roman-Greek world of culture. The high degree of culture which the world had attained in his day contained in itself such a deep moral corruption. With all the outward splendor & brilliance everything was inwardly rotting & foul, full of decay & the smell of death.

In the foregoing section Paul speaks of man in general, of natural mankind which is estranged from God. Therefore this moral description of his applies also to the generation of our day. One cannot better characterize the religious-moral condition of the world which we have before our eyes, even of the civilized world, than with these words of the Apostle. It is an idolatrous generation, a generation forgetful of God, which dwells here upon this earth. Who still thanks God for his goodness, to which he owes life & well-being? The religion, that is, the pseudo-religion of the world is the degradation of the creature. The world idolizes its great ones, its heroes; they idolize themselves, their own power, wisdom, ability, their own accomplishments & achievements. Even the philosophical opinion of God & the revelation of God is nothing else than the transformation of God into the image of a weak, mortal man. Man measures God & divine things according to human standards. The generation of this time is an adulterous generation. That whereon the world feeds & indulges itself is the desire of the flesh, the lust of the eye, shame & uncleanness. The fleshly desires of lustful men are no longer satisfied by common whoredom, but yearn for extraordinary, refined desire & satisfaction. The unnaturalness, the unnatural unchastity has only taken on a different form & manner than at the time of the Apostle. It is a murderous generation among whom we live. Avarice, insatiable greed, which knows no consideration, is the mainspring of business life. One does not permit his neighbor to live next to him, everyone seeks to rise in the world, in that he ruins & tramples others. It is vain scorn & derision when the world writes humanitarianism & general love of mankind upon their banner. And this stream of corruption flows irresistibly onward. One can no longer check & hinder this degenerate state of things. All attempts at reform are a blow in the water. Mankind is bound to unrighteousness as with iron chains. Whither does it lead? It is a destiny which holds sway over the actions & movements of the children of men. God has given them over to this perverted mind. The consciousness of God & morality are still not completely extinguished in this degenerate generation. One still perceives a voice which bears witness of what is right before God & man. But what there is still present of truth serves only to call for the opposition, to prod man on to do the opposite of what is right. And therefore men have no excuse. And so the world pushes on irresistibly to the abyss, to the day of the

wrath & righteous judgment of God.

Finally we can put together the content of this first doctrinal presentation of our Letter, 1, 18-32, in the following summary:

God's wrath from heaven shall be manifest over all the ungodliness & unrighteousness of man, who have denied the true, living God, who has given Himself to be known by them, & therefore according to God's righteous dealing they shame their own bodies in horrible unchastity & do harm & shame to one another, who sin & do outrage against their own nature, against their own feelings & better knowledge, & therefore have no excuse.

Chapter II.

II, 1-5. The Righteous Judgment of Self Does Not Excuse, but Only Increases the guilt.

The Apostle had uncovered the deep moral depravity of the heathen world. Now he takes one man out of the multitude & says to him: "Darum bist du ohne Entschuldigung, o Mensch!"

("Therefore thou art inexcusable, o man"). This one man, as the addition τὸς ὁ κρινων, jeder der da richtet ("whoever thou art that judgest"), shows, represents an entire class of men. With such men the Apostle now enters into judgment, who likewise make a trade out of it & give themselves up to enjoyment that they judge to bring sentence upon another. And certainly, as it presents itself in the following, an unfavorable, condemnatory judgment is meant. These people, with whom Paul deals here, criticize, judge others for the sake of their evil works. But such a man, who decides against another, is without excuse, as this according to 4, 20 is meant of men in general. With the 16, therefore, the Apostle points back to the immediately preceding expression, 1, 32. There it was emphasized that men, even tho they know the legal maxim of God, still commit the previously mentioned evil things, yea, even give approval to the evil doers. Whoever sins & commits a crime against better knowledge & conscience has no excuse. And therefore the one is inexcusable who judges another. In what respect (this is so) is explained by the two following statements which are introduced by γὰρ. "Denn damit, dass du den andern urtheilst, wirst du dich selbst, denn du sollst verurtheilt werden, da du richtest" ("for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same thing"). We take the εἰς ὅ in the sense of εἰς τοῦτο, ὅτι, "damit, dass", not in the sense of εἰς τοῦτο, εἰς ὅ, "worinnen", "worinnen du richtest", for then must one much rather expect the plural εἰς ὅς corresponding to the following τὰ ὅτι. Such a man who judges, with this judgment of his, which he expresses over against another, judges himself; because he himself commits the very thing which he criticizes in another. And so truly he has no

excuse, in that with his action he not only denies his own better knowledge, but the moral judgment which he has expressly made applicable to himself, his own speech. The Apostle differentiates three classes of unrighteous ones. The one serves in cleanse & unrighteousness, with the injury of their conscience, except that they thereby think to excuse & justify their evil deeds. The second group does the same things & defend, extenuate, & praise even that which they well know is objectionable & worthy of death. 1, 32. But there is still a third class of men, who on the contrary criticize & judge evil, but only in others, not in themselves, who themselves boldly do that for which they criticize & reprove others, & therewith appease their conscience, that they still possess & express the right moral judgment. And these of the third class are the worst. 2, 1. Anyone can here raise the question, whether such deluded men really exist? Still the portrayal of morals of the Apostle corresponds exactly to the facts. Yes, at all times there are to be found such, foul, sanctimonious moralists and judges of morals, who become angry & fly into a passion over the evil of others, while they themselves are guilty of if not the same, then still other similarly severe & weighty crimes, who judge the morals in others, but will not see the beams in their own eyes. And as perverted is the human heart that it convinces itself & finally also believes that the correct knowledge, speech, judgment make up for & make good the perverted behavior. Such sorts are most of all the people whom the world admires & highly praises as heroes of virtue & prophets of morality.

As in the previous section these points were called to our attention, that men are incapable & that they are fallen under wrath, so here also to the ἀναμόνυτος. 2, 7 there is added the allusion to the future judgment. "Wir wissen aber," thus the Apostle testifies in the name of all Christians, "dass das Gericht Gottes in Wirklichkeit ergel-t über die, so solche verüben" ("But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things"). In any case 2, 5, which is to be taken as the 2, 5, μετὰ τὸ κρίναι, and not γὰρ, is the more confirmed reading. To κρίναι 2, 5 is the final, deciding judgment of God, which God delivers on the day of judgment. 1, 5, and certainly according to the context the condemning judgment of God; this passes upon those who commit the evil things which are enumerated in the preceding section, thus also over those men whom Paul here has before his eyes. Whomever always does evil shall be affected by God's judgment, even tho he also criticizes the evil in others. The modifier κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, that is, "in Wirklichkeit", "truthfully", "according to the truth", similar to ἐν ἀλήθειᾳ, Matt. 22, 16; ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ, Mark 12, 14, not "nach dem Maaßstab der Wahrheit", strong thus this expression stands against an erroneous presentation of man, with which the Apostle proceeds in the following.

"Meinest du aber, o Mensch, dass du richtigst, die solche verüben und dass es doch, dass du dem Urteil Gottes entfliehen werdest?" ("And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, & dost the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?") 1, 3. With

is the previously expressed apostolic statement is placed over against the delusion of the men who judge these things. The verb ἰσχυί, *ischi* means really censure, "withhold, judge, but then also, as here, *oxinari*, "meinen", "wähnen", think, suppose. Every moralizer presumes that he for his own person - the *su* is stressed - shall escape the condemning judgment of God, that God shall make an exception with him, that the advantage of a better knowledge & righteous judgment, in spite of contradictory action, will protect him before the judgment of God shall guard him from the future wrath. But now the apostle places the question before him & thereby appeals to his conscience: Do you really think that? Does this thought of yours stand the test? It should not be too difficult to recognize that this is a vain hope, that one cannot stand before God with such a glaring difference between speech & action.

With an *ἔτι*, which is common in a double question, the apostle in v. 4 introduces a second question & thereby prevents another perverted notion. "Idee von christl. duden Reichthum seiner Güte, hat Schuld, und Langmuth, indem du erkennst, dass Gottes Güte dich zur Buße führt" ("Or despise thou the riches of his goodness & forbearance & long suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance.")? The man, with whom Paul deals here, appreciates somewhat

to the fact that for the present it still goes well with him, & from that he draws the conclusion that God has nothing against him. Yes, certainly, in time God shows to sinners the richness of His goodness, overwhelms them with benefits of all kinds. He causes His sun to rise daily on the good & the evil & permits rain to fall on the just & the unjust. And He is patient & long suffering, above measure, endures (*ἔχον*, *echon*) the offenses which men commit against Him, & postpones the punishment. But what is aimed at with such goodness of God? These lead the sinner to repentance, to a change of disposition, *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, *eis metanoia*. That really takes place a parte Dei. As the truth, which was manifested in the works of the creation, urges & obligates men to give God the honor & to live to His pleasure, so the rich goodness of God, which sinful men enjoy in this time of divine forbearance & long suffering, includes in itself the constraint & the impulse to repentance, to a turning from their evil ways. Still how do men, & certainly men in general, accept such favor of God? As they suppress the truth by unrighteousness, thus they fail to appreciate, which here reads *ἀγνοεῖν*, *agnoein*, that they would know nothing of the fact that the goodness of God leads them to repentance, & thus they despise the riches of the divine goodness,

forbearance, & long suffering, forcefully stifle the impression which God's favors make upon the heart & conscience. Thus finally also the experience of the divine goodness must serve to the end to make men inexcusable. Only those who have been led to repentance & really converted by the one means of grace & salvation, thru God's Word & Spirit, thereby also open their hearts to the sunshine of divine goodness & love, by which they are surrounded, & they take the time

of the patience & long suffering of God truly for their own improvement, for the salvation of their souls. In particular, however, such a man proves himself, the other judges, not only himself, as a despiser of the divine goodness, patience, & long suffering. And now the apostle questions him, & even this question is an appeal to his conscience: "How? You despise the riches of the divine goodness, etc.? That you dare? That you take upon yourself?" You dare to venture to defy the great, all-bountiful, patient, long suffering God?

With an affirmative statement the explanation winds up with ἀντιστάς ὁ κριτής. Hehe nach deiner Verstocktheit und deinem unbussfertigen Herzen häufst du dir selbst den Zorn an. Tage des Zorns und der Offenbarung des gerechten Urtheils Gottes! ("But after thy hardness & impenitent heart treasure up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath & revelation of the righteous judgment of God"). V. 5. The man who himself does the evil which he criticizes in others, "does neither let himself be frightened by the judgment of God, which threatens in the future, nor be moved by God's goodness, which he experiences in the present." Hofmann. Instead of repenting, instead of leaving his evil works, he much rather (SE) heaps up for himself wrath, according to the stubbornness, the hardness of his heart (ἐκ ἀποστήρας), in which he rejects every effect of the goodness of God, according to his impenitent heart. He heaps sin upon sin, misuses the rich gifts of the divine goodness, for the satisfaction of his fleshly lusts, spends the time of divine patience & long suffering for evil doing, & in this manner heaps up wrath upon himself. While God shows to him the riches of His goodness, forbearance, & long suffering, he assembles for himself an evil treasure of wrath, ὀνείραυσι SE. And this wrath bursts upon him, when he has reached his measure on the day of wrath, when God's patience & long suffering shall have come to an end, when God's goodness gives place to the wrath of God, on the day when the righteous judgment of God shall be revealed to all men.

Summary of the section, 2,1-5: Those who not only sin against better knowledge, but even judge others & still do the same things, which they criticize in others, are inexcusable above others & shall least of all escape the future wrath.

2,6-16. The Impartial Judgment of God.

2,6-10.

"Welcher vergelten wird einem Jeglichen nach seinen Werken" ("Who shall render to every man according to his deeds"). V. 6. Even in that God's righteousness shows itself in judgment, it loves to join a self-evident important thought to the foregoing statement by means of a relative. We can also translate into German thus: "Und der, nämlich Gott, wird einem Jeden nach seinen Werken vergelten." This statement is carried out further in utramque partem, according to the members of the good & the

evil works. It reads in v. 7: $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \kappa\alpha\theta' \upsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\omega\nu\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\iota\mu\eta\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\phi\theta\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \xi\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota \xi\omega\eta\nu \kappa\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu$. The predicate $\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\epsilon\iota$ self-evidently applies also for this modifier of the 6. case. But the question is: which one or which ones of the here-designated activities belong to this predicate as object? The preceding words are variously construed by the expositors. Most of them, for example, Meyer, Weiss, Philippi, Sordet, Luthardt & also already the ancient ones, take $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma - \xi\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ as one expression & then, letting $\xi\omega\eta\nu \kappa\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu$ depend on $\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\epsilon\iota$, translate thus: "denen, welche in bedenklichen Werken nach Herrlichkeit und Ehre und unvergänglichem Wesen trachten, (wird er) ewiges Leben (entgeltend)." Still in the parallel statement in v. 10 $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\iota\mu\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta\nu$, so evidently here in v. 7 $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\iota\mu\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\phi\theta\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$ serves for the designation of that which shall fall to man's lot from God on that day. And $\kappa\alpha\theta' \upsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\omega\nu\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon$ corresponds obviously to the $\kappa\alpha\tauὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ$, v. 6, thus designates the standard of the divine reward, not the norm of the human striving, as one can then also imagine with difficulty, how the striving for eternal life should be ruled thru works. The latter argument also speaks against the combination of $\kappa\alpha\theta' \upsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\omega\nu\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon$ in itself alone with $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, as is advocated by Bengel & others, in the sense of "denen, welche nach der Beharrung im guten Werk geartet sind." The connection of the article with a substantive ruled by $\kappa\alpha\tauὰ$ is moreover not demonstrable otherwise. The Greek says well $\omicron\acute{\iota} \xi\acute{\epsilon} \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omega\nu$, but not $\omicron\acute{\iota} \kappa\alpha\tauὰ ἔργα$ and the like. Therefore with Hofmann we take $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ as an independent expression, $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\iota\mu\eta\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\phi\theta\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ as object to $\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\epsilon\iota$, $\xi\omega\eta\nu \kappa\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu$ as object to $\xi\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$, and understand the apostolic statement thus, that God shall recompense one with glory & honor & incorruptible life in conformity with the perseverance in good works, in that they seek eternal life. That the simple $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{\omicron}$, v. 8, corresponds to the $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, v. 7, does not stand in the way of this explanation, since the reverse side in v. 8 is formulated in an entirely different manner. And if the last words, $\xi\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota \xi\omega\eta\nu \kappa\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu$, in general give a passive sense, then one cannot say that they technically hobble along behind our interpretation. Thus the God, who on that day shall reward everyone according to his works, shall recompense good to the one according to his good works. Nevertheless, Paul does not write $\kappa\alphaτ' ἔργα ἄγαθὰ$, but $\kappa\alpha\theta' \upsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\omega\nu\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon$, in that with the singular he designates the collective, uniform works of life as a good work & draws attention to the fact that those concerned continue in good works to the end. In conformity with such good works God shall in the future acknowledge them & give to them $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha$, "Herrlichkeit," glory; the righteous shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father, Matt. 13:43; $\tau\iota\mu\eta$, "Ehre," honor, we shall rule with Christ, 1 Tim. 2, 12; incorruptible life, the pure, unspotted & therefore unfading & incorruptible possession of the future world, cf. 1 Pet. 1, 4. These are the three parts, the three leading features of eternal life. The men of whom the discussion is here seek eternal life, earnestly strive to become blessed, as this is proven by their zeal in doing good, & thus they also finally find

what they are seeking. The reverse, what is to be remarked concerning those who do evil, the Epistle does not introduce into the structure of the previous sentence, vv. 6, 7, but gives that in a self-evident expression, in that he continues: τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐπιθειῶν καὶ ἀπειθοῦσιν καὶ τῷ ἀπειθεῖ, πεποιμένους δὲ τῷ ἁδικίᾳ θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ. V. 8. οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐπιθειῶν, to be sure, is a general Greek manner of speech, corresponding to οἱ ἐκ πικτεῶν, οἱ ἐκ περὶ πύργου, οἱ ἐκ νόμου, Rom. 7:5; 4:12, 14. Those are meant whose moral disposition & frame of mind flow from the ἐπιθειῶν. Ἐπιθειῶν is derived from ἐπιθεῶς, "to manœuvre, laborer, & means mercenary, bribery, & then more general self-interest, selfishness, willfulness, not, however, as it is commonly taken, party doings or spirit of intrigue, love of dispute. In his dictionary of New Testament Greek Bremser has proven that from the profane Greek use of language the more general meaning fits also in all the N. T. passages in which the word is found, Gal. 5:20; 11 Cor. 12:20; Phil. 1:16; James 3:14, 15. In our passage οἱ ἐξ ἐπιθειῶν are the self-willed ones, who everywhere "ihro schlechte Ich geltend machen," Hofmann, & who therefore do not obey the truth, which is contrary to this perverted self, but much rather obey the unrighteousness, which is inwardly like them & is therefore agreeable. Here is meant the truth in the moral sphere, similarly as in Eph. 4:21; 6:14, that which is the Law & Gods will regarding the conduct of man; the self-willed strive against this ~~the~~ truth, even tho it is revealed to them thru the natural revelation or thru the Word. To those who are thus minded & disposed & thus serve unrighteousness shall fury & wrath be shown on that day; θυμῷ, act of boiling up, "Aufwallung," exand exantia, strengthens the concept ὀργῇ.

The expression of the double recompense repeats itself in v. 9, 10, only in an inverted, "hiastischer" order. "tribulation und angst über jede seite her kommen, drücken, drücken, drücken, bringen" ("tribulation & anguish, upon every side of man that doeth evil"). The fury & wrath of God brings upon the evil doers "tribulation und angst," as Luther has well translated into the German, really "Drangsal und Bedrängnis," oppression & distress. The στενωπία is the most extreme degree of ὀδύς, as one sees, from 11 Cor. 4:8: ἐν παντί ὀδύμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ στενωπώμενοι, "in allem gedrückt, doch nicht erdrückt" ("we are troubled on every side, yet not distressed"). The gods do not know what to do on the day of judgment; they do not know where to go in or out. "Whither shall I flee?" Both, ὀδύς and στενωπία, concern the entire man, according to body & soul. Such severe distress - ὀδύς is to be supposed - shall come over that soul of man which performs the evil, ἐπὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, which means according to the analogy of the Hebrew, על כל איש ואיש, "over every individual person" cf. Rom. 13:1: ὑποταξάμενοι τῇ ἀρχῇ, "Jedermann sei unterthan der Obrigkeit" ("Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers") etc. "Herrlichkeits aber und Ehre und Friede (wird zu Theil werden) einem Jedem, der das Gute wirkt" ("But glory, honor, & peace to every man that

worketh good"). Instead of $\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta\eta\theta$ it here reads $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta$, which is as much as the Hebrew וְיִשְׁעוּ , "Heal, salvation, complete salvation, perfect welfare & well-being. The activity of the evil ones is designated in v. 2 with $\kappa\alpha\iota\epsilon\pi\gamma\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\theta\alpha$, the activity of the good in v. 3 with the simple $\epsilon\pi\gamma\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\theta\alpha$; "for many go on farther in evil than in good." Luther & L. take both of these statements the Apostle still adds the remark, that what he says here applies to the Jews & Greeks, & certainly to the Jews in particular; to the first sentence $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\kappa\alpha\iota\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta$, and to the second $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta\kappa\alpha\iota\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\eta$. The reward of God is general, concerns Jews & Greeks, both that which belongs to the reward of the evil & that of the good. But the Jews here also have a prerogative over the Gentiles. "As the Jews God had especially revealed Himself; they have the Law & promises, to them first of all the Gospel was preached, 1:16; thus they shall also take the precedence in the judgment of God, they are the first and closest objects of the divine judging."

"Thus in this section, 2:6-10, the Apostle teaches a reward according to works, according to good works as well as according to evil works. The statement, that the wrath & terror of God shall be all the child bore, has nothing extraordinary, but in the other statement, that God shall reward those who do good according to their perseverance in good works with eternal life, some have taken offense. Fritzsche says here very mainly that the Apostle has here gone too far in his zeal about good works & has fallen into contradiction with himself, in that what he writes here does not agree with 2:10 and in general not with his doctrine of justification. After the example of Melancthon & Flacius the later Lutheran theologians, for the most part, in order to avoid this difficulty & exclude papistic deductions, have designated the preceding apostolic declaration as a plurimie legalis or a sententia legalis; they say, so that Paul speaks here from the standpoint of the Law, which is "corrected" (corrected) by the Gospel, or he speaks conditionaliter. If there were such men, who there are not, who only do good unto the end & in the Law perfectly, then God would reward them with eternal life for their good works. But the future, $\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\delta\iota\omega\varsigma\epsilon\iota$, "ever and ever, he will reward," is, to speak with God, "no form of condition." The Apostle here speaks "apodictisch" of that which shall really take place on the day of judgment. And so as here, so the Scripture speaks in many passages concerning the future reward. In Rom. 6:23 it reads according to the Septuagint: $\delta\tau\epsilon\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\iota\omega\varsigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\gamma\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\alpha\epsilon\pi\gamma\alpha\alpha\delta\tau\omicron\upsilon$, Prov. 27:12: $\delta\varsigma\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\delta\iota\omega\varsigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\gamma\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\alpha\epsilon\pi\gamma\alpha\alpha\delta\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Christ says in Matt. 16:27: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory... and then he shall reward every man according to his works," $\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\tau\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\delta\iota\omega\varsigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\gamma\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\alpha\tau\eta\nu\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\delta\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Similarly in 1 Cor. 5:29: "And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; & they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Paul writes in 11 Cor. 5:10: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that everyone may receive the thing done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Ep. 6:7-9; Eph.

6, 8; Col. 3, 24 in the Revelation of St. John the Lord announces: "And I will give unto every one of you according to your works." Rev. 2, 23. And in Rev. 20, 12 we read: "And the dead were judged... according to their works." All these are evidently not hypothetical but positive statements. The Lord, & certainly even Christ the Lord shall actually on the Last Day reward every one according to his works, according to that which he had done in the life of his body, whether it be good or bad. The works of men appear in the Scriptures throughout as the actual norm of the judgment. The only question is, how is this to be understood, especially with regard to the good works. There it is first of all to be considered that the concept of the norm does not necessarily include in itself the concept of meritoriousness. As the Scriptures otherwise testify, e.g., Rom. 6, 23, the godless with their evil works well deserve hell, but contrariwise the devout do not deserve salvation with their good works. To be sure, everything that we do & suffer here below in love to God & Christ shall be recompensed in heaven, & we can also say: shall be well rewarded. Matt. 5, 12. But, as Calvin correctly remarks, *Stultus consequentia est, ex mercede statui meriti*. On the other hand, the *κε τὰ ἐν κατὰ τὰ ἔργα* in no way says that that which God rewards & gives must always correspond exactly to the measure & worth of that which man has done. Death, wrath & condemnation is really the adequate punishment for the evil actions of men, & a judge would deal unjustly, if he awarded a transgressor a more severe punishment than he has deserved. But, on the other hand, it stands in the free opinion of the judge how highly he will estimate the reward for good works, & it does not contradict justice when he here permits his goodness to reign & also richly & abundantly rewards simple works. We know that the reward of God, the reward of eternity shall far, far surpass our works. Lator remarks according to *Proterius*: *Hoc interest quod poena non potest ex justitiam excedere, mercedem criminis; praemium autem, excedat clementia liberalitas, potest esse majus, quam quantum facta, per se valeant*. Reward according to the standard of works signifies in itself nothing else, nothing more & nothing less, than that God repays good with good, evil with evil. *Bona factis bona, malis factis mala Deus reddet*. And this is certainly a proof of divine justice. Ep. 11. Thess. 1, 5-6. But we must still go a step further & consider more closely, who the persons are who do good & who do evil, & whom Paul has in mind in our passage & the Scriptures in the cited parallel passages. Christ Himself gives us more exact information as to how He means it, when He says that everyone shall be rewarded according to his works in that solemn description of the final judgment, Matt. 25, 31-46. When the Son of man shall come in His glory & shall sit upon the judgment throne, then, on the one hand, He will welcome, praise, & lead with Himself into eternal life those who have exercised themselves in works of mercy, particularly in good works, but, on the other hand, He shall cast from Himself, shall cast into everlasting fire, those who have done no good but only evil. But now in this connection the Lord gives exact information concerning the nature & disposition of

both classes of men. Those who stand at his right hand & have done good are like the sheep which are the sheep of his fold, his believers; the others, who stand at his left hand & have done evil works, are like the goats, that is, those who have been hostile to & alienated from Christ, the unbelievers. What decides regarding the position over against Christ on that day, what decides regarding salvation & condemnation, is faith & unbelief. But faith necessarily brings forth good fruits, proves itself outwardly before men in all sorts of good works, while the unbelievers remain & live in their sin & serve in wickedness. And so in the final judgment, which is a public transaction, the Lord shall prove the faith of his own, from their works & thus vindicate his decision before the whole world; & He shall at the same time the good work, the works of faith of his own, with eternal life, which He gives to the believer or, what is the same thing, which is there given out of grace, while the unbelievers, who have lived & died in their sin, shall receive in the eternal torment the deserved reward of their evil works. Thus, that which Paul in the foregoing section & the Scripture in general teach concerning the reward of works, especially of the good works, agrees very well with that which Paul otherwise & the Scriptures in general teach concerning the facts of salvation & condemnation. One might still take into consideration that according to the Scriptures, faith & all the good works of the believers are the work & effect of divine grace; so fällt alles Leben darin, als ob mit der Vergeltung der Werke der Gnade Gottes Abbruch geschähe, indem eben Gott in und mit der Belohnung der guten Werke nur sein eigenes Werk thut. The explanation of the apostolic statement, 2, 6-10, which is given here, not only finds its advocates among the modern expositors, for example, Chénier & Luthardt, but can also be designated as the genuinely Lutheran explanation. Koerner, the co-author of the Formula of Concord, in his commentary on the letter to the Romans, gives his exegesis on the words of Paul in the following manner: *Contentia haec est, quod Deus justus sit datorus bonae, injustis vero inflictorus poenae: qui vero justis sint, ex evangelio explicandum est. Nam justis sunt fidei justificati, qui credunt in filium Dei et edunt postea fructus spiritus bonos, qui sunt opera bona. Injusti vero et damnati sunt, qui non credunt: horum opera aut mala sunt, ita aeternam poenam ipsa merentur. Deus vero justus donabit vitam aeternam, non propter ipsorum opera, sed propter mediatorem Christum, in quem credunt; eorum tamen opera communiabit et ornabit praemiis, eo, quod ex Deo sint et fide facta; malos autem officiet poenis, si enim carent fide. The typology of the Augsburg Confession, in its Third Article (see Mueller, L.B., p. 148) lets itself be understood thus over this treatment: "Aber die Schrift nennt das ewige Leben einen Lohn, nicht dass Gott schuldig sei um die Werke das ewige Leben zu geben, sondern nachdem das ewige Leben sonst gegeben wird aus andern Ursachen, dass dennoch damit vergolten werden unsere Werke und Trübsale, obsonder Schatz, so gross ist, dass*

ihm Gott uns um die Werke nicht schuldig wäre. Gleichwie das Erbtheil oder alle Güter eines Vaters dem Sohn gegeben werden und sind eine reiche Vergeltung und Belohnung seines Behorrens, aber dennoch empfähet er das Erbe nicht um seines Verdienstes willen, sondern dass es ihm der Vater gönnet als ein Vater usw. Darum ist es genug, dass das ewige Leben deshalb werde ein Lohn genennet, dass dadurch vergolten werden die Trübsale so wir leiden, und die Werke der Liebe, die wir thun, ob es wohl damit nicht verdient wird. Denn es ist zweierlei Vergelten, eins, das man schuldig ist, das andere, das man nicht schuldig ist. Als, so der Kaiser einem Diener ein Fürstenthum gibt, damit wird vergolten der Dieners Arbeit und ist doch die Arbeit nicht würdig des Fürstenthums, sondern der Diener bekennet, es sei ein Gnadenlehen. Also ist uns Gott um die Werke nicht schuldig das ewige Leben; aber dennoch so es gibt um Christus willen den Süßbigen, so wird damit unser Leiden und Werk vergolten. (See Triglotia, p. 220.) The Apology then adds that according to this rule the statement in Rom. 2, 6 ff. is also to be understood. It is well to consider that our Confession here, exactly as Paul in 2, 7 and 2, 10, designates eternal life itself, not only special gifts & grades of glory, as reward & recompense of good works. Even the modern dogmaticians & exegeses, after they have tired themselves out to gain a hypothetical connotation from the simple wording of the text, finally return to the right track & place that untenable interpretation, often entirely uncontradicted at the side of the correct exegesis. They remark almost collectively, that the good works, which God shall reward, come into consideration as *signa et testimonia, fidei sacrificia*. Calov writes: *secundum opera fiet - thus de facto fiet - ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος, non vero secundum merita operum, nec propter opera*. Nam etiam in malis operibus debetur retributio, si justitiae divinae, quibus meremur mortem, Rom. 1, 32; 6 ult., bona tamen opera non merentur vitam. ... *sum retributurum Deum secundum opera dicit (apostolus), recte utique contra Pontificios observant nostraten, aliud esse secundum opera, id est secundum testimonium operum, quae de interiora fide et in credulitate testantur, aliud vero propter opera, id est propter meritum operum aliquid reddere*. ... Recte etiam notant, nequam dici *ὅτι τὰ ἔργα*, propter opera, sed *κατὰ τὰ ἔργα*, secundum opera, quia opera erunt quidem manifesta. *ὅτι καὶ ὁ κ. p. 16 ἄ, regula, non autem proportionata meritorum norma*. Nec minus observatur probe a nostris, quod sacra scriptura non utatur verbo *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος*, quod ad mercedem proprie dictam quaedam specie trahi posset, sed *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος*, quod generale est, ac tum etiam locum habet, cum Deus ex gratia non merita nostrae, sed sua dona coronat. And in Gerhard, *Loc. theol.* XVIII, C. 8, para. 116, we read: *Ex illo fide postea bene operamur ac nix Christo vere inuito esse demonstramus, in iisdem operibus, tanquam in via, ad ultimam vitae aeternae possessionem ambulantes eandem ex gratia per fidem tandem consequimur, quo*

59.
2, 11-16.

senau illud ἡ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν καὶ ὑπομονὴν καὶ ἀσθένειαν καὶ ὑπομονὴν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν
 accipiendum erit, si ad renatos transferatur, sique bona opera sunt vias regni, non
 causa regnandi, ut Bernhardus legitur. Further in para. 114: Operibus mercedem (gratiam)
 dari concedimus, propter opera eandem dari negamus, conditionem operis ad mercedem
 requiri concedimus, causalitatem vero operis intercedere negamus. When Gerhard also con-
 strues the words in 2, 7 otherwise than we have done, thus he still very correctly here refers the
 discussion of the Apottle to the regenerated, the believers, & that which shall really be given to them
 on the day of judgment.

Still one thing we have to remark concerning the merces regni. It is that to which many comment-
 ators drew attention, that Paul in this first principle part of this letter 1, 18-3, 20, describes the moral
 condition of men, Gentiles & Jews, considered & viewed from the redemption thru Christ. But now with
 this presentation in 2, 5 he has come to speak of the final judgment & stays with this theme, 2, 13-15.
 And there he self-evidently supposes that which precedes the end: the final judgment, the redemption
 thru Christ, the course & the operation of the Gospel, thus the fact that only the Gospel, the faith in Christ
 makes men fit ^{for} & capable of good works, as well known to the Christians. He does not venture further
 here to prove how it comes to good works with men, but in that he brings out the righteous-
 ness of the divine wrath, which reaches out to the evil & good, he points simply to the fact that there are
 men who really do good & continue in good unto the end. But when one raises the question, which one
 cannot completely dismiss, what kind of people are they who do good then the answer is to be taken
 out of the context of Christian doctrine: qui vero iusti sint, ex evangelio explicandum est. No more.

2, 11-16.

The Apostle has finally called attention to the fact that God, when He shall reward anyone
 according to his works, makes no difference between Jews & Gentiles. And even this equaliza-
 tion of the Jews with the Gentiles he establishes now in 11 with the general statement that with
 God there is no respect of persons. The expression προσώπων ἀδιακρίσειν, from which προσώ-
 πων ἡ διακρίσις is derived, corresponds to the Hebrew מִן כָּל אָדָם וְאִשָּׁה and signifies "Nas tingesicht
 oder die Person annehmen oder ansehen," "Jemanden beachten," "beunflügeln" (flavor,
 patronize), but in the N.T. it is used only male sensu, of partial consideration, which allows
 itself to be determined & corrupted by the outward appearance, by outward advant-
 ages. God would be partial, if He would permit Himself to be influenced in His judgment
 by the outward prerogatives which the Jews had over the Gentiles. But this is not the case. The
 following double sentence in v. 12 proves specially the impartiality of God. As many as have
 sinned without the Law, ἀνόμους, that is, without being in possession of a positive Law, &

thereby the Gentiles are evidently meant, who are without the Law, except that they are judged, also are lost, according to the norm of a positive Law. Paul writes *ἵνα πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* "in that he changes his place to the standpoint of the final judgment & looks backwards from there. The *κρίσι* before *ἵνα* does not indicate that the future destiny of these lawless persons shall correspond to their transgression. As many, on the other hand, as have sinned with the Law, that is, have sinned in the possession of a positive Law & that applies to the Jews, shall be judged and convicted by the Law, according to the norm of this Law of theirs. For with the *κρίσι* here there is evidently meant a condemning judgment. While one takes *ἐν νόμῳ*, corresponding to the *ἐν νόμῳ*, best as an adverbial modifier, with the *ἐν νόμῳ* there is a pointing to the decided Law of the Jews, as the *νόμος* without the article very often designates this concrete thing, the Mosaic Law. Thus whether with or without the possession of the Law, whether Gentile or Jew, in either case the sinner falls under the judgment of God. And the prerogative of the Jews over the Gentiles, that the Jews have received the revealed & written Law, shall in no way remove them from the judgment of condemnation of God, when they have transgressed the Law; the transgressors of the Law shall much rather be judged & condemned by the Law. The latter expression, thus *ἐν νόμῳ*, is now confirmed again, in v. 13, with a general statement, namely by this, that with God it does not depend on the hearing, but on the doing of the Law. The Apostle here speaks of the hearers of the Law, because among the Jews the possession of the Law is proven by the fact that they hear the Law read in their assemblies in the synagog every Sabbath. In this hearing of the Law they do themselves some good. But those who only hear the Law are not justified before God, according to God's judgment, for the sake of their mere hearing. Much rather only the doers of the Law are justified. The *δικαιοσύνη* is here evidently meant as *actus fornicis*, corresponding to the Hebrew *פְּרָטָה*. Only those who perform the Law shall be declared righteous by God.

It is, or remarked, a general basic fact, which the Apostle presents in v. 13. And as one usually takes the *ἐν νόμῳ* as the future of logical result & translates it with the present. And with this one notes that the foregoing statement of Paul contains only an abstract rule, a hypothetical speech, if a man would really perform the Law, that is, would fulfill it completely & fully, then he would also be regarded by God as righteous, but now there are no such men, & so, because no flesh shall be justified by the works of the Law, righteousness comes of faith. And all that in itself is very correct. But the question arises, whether such considerations are in place here.

It is first of all to be considered that the Apostle in our passage does not compare, as in Rom. 10, 5 ff.; Gal. 3, 11, the righteousness from the Law, which builds itself upon the doing of the Law, with the righteousness of faith, but only calls attention to the contrast between hearing & doing of the Law, only emphasizes that God judges a man not according to his hearing but according to his doing.

of the Law. Herein particular the discussion is not concerning the solemn justification and the modus justificationis. The cardinal question, How the sinner is justified before God, can stand before God, how the sinner gains the judgment of God for himself, gains a gracious God, is first treated later, from 3, 21 on. Further one might consider that the Apostle otherwise, & certainly also in the Letter to the Romans & even in our chapter of the text, speaks of men who actually fulfill the Law, observe the legal demands of the Law, Rom. 3, 4; 2, 26. 27. They are the Christians, the regenerated, 2, 29, who have the Holy Spirit, 3, 2. The believing Christians appear in the Scriptures as $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ $\nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$. The believers walk in the Commandments of God, are also obedient to the Law of God from the heart; they love God, & that is love to God that they keep His Commandments; & if they also do not fulfill the Law of God completely, still their defects are covered with the perfect righteousness of Christ. And this interpretation of the concept "Häuter des Gesetzes" is also indicated in our passage by the context. The doers of the Law are still evidently identical with the persons of whom the Apostle had already spoken previously, 2, 7, 10, with those who then do good & who continue in good works unto the end. Thus also Philippi's remarks on our verse, that in the power of justifying grace the $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ of the $\nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$ is certainly possible. But the question arises, if the doers of the Law, then they shall also be recognized as such by God. And more will not be pronounced on the basis of $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\beta\alpha\iota$ in our place. But it does not read $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\beta\alpha\iota$, but $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. And what finally concerns this future, thus one hardly rejects the impression, to which also Klostermann calls attention, that the same lies on the same level with the other futures of this context, which point to the final judgment, thus with $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, v. 6, & $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ and $\kappa\pi\iota\omicron\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, v. 12, and $\kappa\pi\iota\upsilon\epsilon\iota$, v. 16, thus designates something which shall really happen on the day of judgment. But certainly one dare not exploit this future in the manner as, for example, Hodet does. He writes: "The imparted righteousness is the beginning of the work of salvation, the means of entering into the condition of grace. But this original righteousness, in that it reinstates the communion between God & man, must lead the latter to the actual possession of the righteousness, which means for the fulfillment of the Law; otherwise the first righteousness would not stand in the judgment. For that very reason that which might assert an antinomian, unwelcome tendency, corresponds to the thought of the Apostle to distinguish a two-fold justification; the original, based exclusively on faith, & the final, based on faith & its fruits." Such exegesis directly contradicts the Pauline doctrine of justification, is likewise in no way demanded by the reading of the text. Even if one understood the $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in our passage concerning the justification $\iota\omega\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\omega\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, still there would not thereby be taught a justification from works, on the basis of the fruits of faith. It is still two different things, whether one says that the doers of the Law, even these persons, are justified,

or whether it is said that those concerned are justified for the works' sake. According to the script-
ure the matter comports itself much more so: What places us into the right position, into the
correct relationship with God is faith alone. That which covers & protects the sinner before the
countenance of the holy God, already now & also finally in the last judgment, that which makes
him just before God in the solemn sense of the word, in time & in eternity, is only the blood & right-
eousness of Christ, which he grasps in faith, with the exclusion of all works. But whoever has
become justified thru Christ & thru faith in Christ then also shows his faith in good works, or,
what is the same thing, in the fulfillment of the Law; since real faith is a living & active thing.
And on that day Christ the Lord, as He Himself has taught in Matt. 25, 31 ff., shall praise His
believers on that account, because they have exercised mercy, have served Him in His simple brethren,
thus have fulfilled the principle law of love; He shall prove their faith in their works, & shall pro-
nounce, acknowledge, & present them thus before all the world as righteous ones, Σικαιοῖς, Matt.
25, 37: 46, while the others who are destitute of such works He shall condemn. "There He shall
then pronounce the judgment... & it certainly runs strangely, that He places it upon these & places
at the base & reason for the same, that they have done or not done these works, as He relates them
here... & afterward the judgment shall fall to both parts, who have done or not done such
works, as public testimony of the fruit of their faith & their unbelief." Further, Kirchenpostille. And
to just this public testimony of the last day we now also point the Σικαιοὶ ὁποῖα, in our passage.
That two-fold recompense, which is spoken of in 2, 6-10, shall be preceded by a double judgment
of the Judge, a condemning, κρι. ὁποῖα, v. 12, which concerns the transgressors of the Law, & an
acquitting, acknowledging sentence, which is imparted to the doers of the Law, v. 13. Here in v. 12 is
a simple contrast, κρι. ὁποῖα - Σικαιοὶ ὁποῖα, as proposed, as in Matt. 12, 37: Ἐκ γὰρ
λόγων ὁὖν Σικαιοὶ ὁποῖα, καὶ ἔκ τῶν λόγων ὁὖν καὶ Σικαιοὶ ὁποῖα. Except that in our pass-
age, where the Apostle would only show the impartiality of the divine judgment, he does not more
closely present how it comes to the action of the Law. But that also according to his meaning the
justifying faith is here the supposition presents itself clearly enough from the context of his
instruction. Certainly it is a general rule, which the ὁποῖα expresses in the entire sentence, 2, 12.
Still in that he adds to the negative statement οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀποστασι τοῦ νόμου Σικαιοὶ πᾶσι
τῶν θεῶν the corresponding position, he writes not simply ἀλλ' οἱ ποιῶσι τοῦ νόμου, καὶ
Σικαιοὶ, but with the future Σικαιοὶ ὁποῖα. He gives his discussion such a turn, that
he points at the same time to the actual judgment of the last day & introduces the opposition to
that κρι. ὁποῖα. Moreover, our Confession also takes the foregoing expression of Paul in 1: 2
not as hypothetical speech, but as a designation of an actual fact. The Synology remarks on
Rom. 2, 13 and similar Scripture passages: Nec describit hic modum justificationis, sed

describit, quales sint facti, postquam iam sunt facti; scatis et renatis. ... In bonis sententiam
 dicitur: Factores boni facti continentur. Rom. 2, 13, hoc est, facti et renati, qui corde
 credunt Deo et deinde habent bonos fructus, qui placent creatori, idem idemque sunt impletio
 legis. Mueller, L. B., p. 131. Similarly, Luther on Gal. 3, 12: "In der Theologie entstehen Thäter
 nicht aus den Werken, sondern aus den durch den Glauben schon ausgerichteten Personen
 werden Leute, welche Werke thun. Von solchen redet Paulus Röm. 2, 13: 'Ist das Gesetz thun,
 werden gerecht, das heisst sie werden, für gerecht gerechnet. ... Darum sind die Thäter des
 Gesetzes nicht die Heuchler, welche aussen das Gesetz thun, sondern die Gläubigen, welche,
 nachdem sie den heiligen Geist empfangen haben, das Gesetz erfüllen, das heisst sich und den
 Nächsten lieben usw., so dass ein Thäter des Gesetzes ist nicht derjenige, welcher durch die
 Werke ein Thäter wird, sondern derjenige, welcher durch die innerliche Wirkung des Glaubens
 bereits ausgerichtet ist, ein Thäter wird.'" H. Louis Edit. II, 338. 342.

There follows a section, 11, 14-16, which belongs to the most difficult part of the letter to the
 Romans. How the connection of the same, which is marked by γὰρ, with the foregoing is meant,
 will be shown at once, when we have pictured to our minds the words in context. It reads, freely, lit.:

Ὅταν γὰρ ἔσθῃ τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα εἰσὶ τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῆ, ὅστω νόμος.
 μὴ ἔχοντες εἰσὶ τοῖς εἰσὶ νόμος. "Denn so oft als die Heiden, die doch das Gesetz nicht haben,
 von Natur die Gebote des Gesetzes thun, so sind diese, obwohl sie das Gesetz nicht haben, sich
 selbst Gesetz" ("For when the Gentiles, which have not the Law, do by nature the things contained in
 the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves"). Thus the apostle here speaks especial-
 ly of the Gentiles. With Luther, Chillingworth & others we rather translate the ἔσθῃ as "reiden". For
 what is said in this verse & in the following concerning this subject, ἔσθῃ, that they do not have the
 Law, are a law unto themselves, that the work of the Law is written in their hearts, still evidently
 applies to the Gentiles in general. The lack of the article does not oblige us to think only of a
 single designated Gentile. The ἔσθῃ without the article also otherwise designates the Gentile
 world in general, 3, 29, and in our passage the adjectival modifiers τὰ μὴ νόμος ἔχοντα makes
 the article entirely unnecessary. 4, 9, 30. To be sure, however, a restriction lies in the ὅταν. Ὅταν
 a temporal particle, quando, quantum, here establishes a situation which not only possibly
 enters in but which actually & certainly often enters in, & thus it signifies "so oft als", similarly

as in Matt. 15, 2; John 8, 44; 1 Cor. 14, 26. For the apostle here argues with a firmly establish-
 ed fact & with the ποιῆ he does not have in mind only a solitary factor. The meaning is not
 that the heathen always do & that all the heathen do that which is expressed in the protasis,
 v. 14a, but that this often happens among the heathen. But what often happens is this, that
 they who still have no Law, like the Jews, τὰ τοῦ νόμου, perform with the constituent parts, the

74.
2, 11-16.

precepts of the Law. The subjectively negative $\omega\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho$ before $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omega\varsigma$ & $\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$ places this modifier in relationship to $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\gamma$. Save that they have the Law, they still do what the Law demands. And certainly they do it $\phi\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota$, by nature, that is, not by their natural powers, but natura ducet magistra, natura docente, led thereto by their own powers, "without being led to that by commandments from the outside, without being instructed from the Mosaic Law: Philippi.

For the most part men point this statement of Paul to the so-called justitia civilis, which is also found among the Gentiles, in that they point to the fact that the Epistle does not ascribe to the Gentiles a $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\gamma$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omega\varsigma$, a doing of the Law as a whole, but only a $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\gamma$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omega\varsigma$, a doing, an observance of isolated demands of the Law. And indeed there certainly were Gentiles, & there still are heathen, whose conduct shows a certain outward conformity to the Law, who live honorably & righteously outwardly. There are heathen, unbelievers, who, being instructed by their own nature, avoid gross shame & crime, who carry out the work of their calling industriously, who preside over their houses well, who give alms to the poor, etc. Yes, it often comes out that otherwise wicked men still shrink back from certain evil deeds, such as lying, perjury, treason, & rouse themselves to noble deeds, sacrifice themselves for others, & the like. And as often as the heathen now do that which is commanded by the Law, they are, even tho they do not have the Law, a law unto themselves. These actions of theirs prove that they are a law unto themselves. Here in the $\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\omicron\alpha\iota\sigma$ the $\omega\pi\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho$ stands before the $\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$; it would mark the contrast between having & doing. The heathen do not have, possess, hear the Law as the Jews do but they are a law unto themselves. This latter expression does not signify, as Hofmann supposes, that they make God's will their will, that their will agrees with the God's will, but can express nothing else than that the Gentiles say to themselves what the Mosaic Law says to the Jews, what is good & evil, that they know of themselves what they should do & not do.

This principle statement, that the Gentiles are a law unto themselves, is now further established in $\nu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$. The relative $\omicron\iota\gamma\iota\upsilon\varsigma$, quippe qui, here also includes a basic declaration in itself: $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\alpha\epsilon\rho\upsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota$. What the Gentiles prove, $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\epsilon\iota\kappa\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, the Epistle now expresses thus: $\tau\alpha\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega\upsilon\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\mu\omega\varsigma$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\delta\iota\tau\omega\upsilon\varsigma$, "as work due, beautiful & good written in their hearts" ("the work of the law written in their hearts"). These words are explained by Hofmann, Lange, Otto, & Klostermann in the sense of Jer. 31, 33, namely, to the point that the doing of the Law or the fulfillment of the Law is to these Gentiles, of whom the discussion is here, a matter of the heart, an earnest concern of the heart. But that is a thought which absolutely does not fit into the context. What the Epistle apparently calls attention to in our passage is that the Gentiles, those who are without the Law, still know something of the Law & have an analogy of that which the Jews possess in the revealed Law. And so most of

the ancient & modern expositors correctly understand the foregoing expression to mean that the work demanded by the Law, thus the precept of the Law, is written in the heart, in the inner part of the Gentiles. The Jews had the Law engrained on the stone tablets & recorded in the Torah before their eyes; the Gentiles found a similar writing of the Law in their inner parts, which demanded essentially the same thing as the written Law demanded of the Jews. Paul writes τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου, and not τὸν νόμον, because the Law is not written in the heart of the Gentiles in its concrete form, as it was before Sinai, but according to its principal content. What is here said specifically of the Gentiles applies self-evidently to all men, who are all formed alike by nature. As far as this Law, this demand of the Law is implanted in the Gentiles in all men in their inner parts, in their nature, in & with the formation of their nature, as far as this forms an inalienable dowry & deposit of the human nature, so far as this Law also be reckoned to nature, ps 119, v. 11, and be said with right that their own nature teaches the heathen mankind, & it says itself what is right & not right. Certainly the natural law does not belong to the real spiritual & physical substance of man. It is, as Luther at expresses himself, as directly in intellectual possession of man. It is not ^{first} substantive, something mediated thru religion. The natural law, this inner norma agendi, is not a product of the human self, of the human spirit. Man perceives in his heart, in his inner part the voice of this Law, but this voice stands out as the voice of another one, as a mistress of his self, & says to him what he should do & not do. The Law written in the heart is the demanding will of God, the voice of God, of the Creator, to whom all his creatures are bound, & which in this manner is manifested to man, whom he has created, from his childhood, what is right & what he will have from him.

The expression "the works of the law written in their hearts" accordingly expresses essentially the same thing as the other, "are a law unto themselves," & serves the latter only as a more complete explanation. And now the Apostle emphasizes that the Gentiles "prove," "show," (erweisen) this, that the works of the Law stand written in their hearts, & shows thereby that they are a law unto themselves. But then whereby do they prove it? Meyer, Weiss, Bodel, Lutherdt & others answer: Even thereby, that they perform the demands of the Law. But that has already been said in the foregoing sentence, & one does not see why the Apostle should repeat this thought, only in another form. No, the verb ἐνδείκνυσθαι, much rather finds its modifier, as, for example, also Bengel, Tholuck, Kloster-

Mann takes it, in the following genitivus absolutus, συμπάσι τοῖς νότοις ἀνθρώποις ὅτι ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν, etc. This action of the Gentiles, designated in v. 14 a, where it appears, with the first proof, a first ἐνδείξις, the testimony of the conscience a second proof, a second ἐνδείξις, of the Law, which the Gentiles bear in their inner part. The Gentiles thus show the work of the Law as written in their hearts, "indem" or "damit, dass ich bewiesen zugleich Zeugnis gibt" (their conscience also

bearing witness". The $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \eta\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$, the conscience is, as Bramer correctly defines it, "das als Judge aufstrebende eigene Bewusstseins". And certainly this attests the moral quality of the human action. Weier. This testimony appears, since the discussion is concerning a $\sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, as something which approaches the expression of the inner law, accompanied the same. Still this double testimony is of a different kind. The conscience is not identical with the natural law. The natural law is a norm, a demand, a demand of God, attests to man in general what is good & evil, dictates to him what he should do & not do. The conscience, on the other hand, demands nothing, but judges the concrete individual actions of man, speaks to man whether that which he now will do or does or has done is or was right or wrong. And there it judges according to the norm imprinted in the inner parts of man, it is not in itself a source of the knowledge of evil and good, but brings forth its judgment out of the natural knowledge of the law. But since the law in the heart is the law of God, therefore in the judgment of the conscience, which is based upon that law, there is manifested what God judges concerning the actions of men. In our passage the apostle has in mind especially the so-called conscientia consequences, which criticize the actions of man post factum. That is shown by the following modifiers: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\omicron\tau\alpha\ \xi\iota\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \rho\alpha\tau\eta\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\pi\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, "und indem die Bedanken unter einander Anklage fuhren oder auch Entschuldigung" ("their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another"). These words do not refer to the intercourse of the Gentiles among themselves, in which one criticizes the other, praising or censuring, as, for example, Meyer & Weier suppose. The expression $\tau\omega\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\omega\iota\varsigma$ evidently points to an occurrence in the inner parts of man. The apostle here further characterizes that testimony of the conscience. The "Bedanken", thoughts, $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\omega\iota\varsigma$, are here not the product of the thinking, reflecting the human self, but according to the context the separate judgments, the separate actions of the conscience. These thoughts stand in an intercommunication of intercourse (Wechselwirkung), $\mu\omicron\tau\alpha\ \xi\iota\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\alpha\iota$, they hold a private talk among themselves. There are contrasting thoughts, which at the same time strive & dispute with one another. They bring up accusations among themselves or make apologies. The object of the accusation or defence is self-evidently the man in whom they rise or descend. The latter expressions recall a legal proceeding. It is a process which takes place in the inner parts of man. The Judge is God, & it is the man who stands under the judgment of God. The witness, accuser, & advocate ^{are} the conscience & the judgments of the conscience. The norm of the judgment is the law, which is written in the heart of man. And now as often as man acts in opposition to this norm, he is accused by his own thoughts, by his own conscience, on the other hand, defended by the same, when his actions correspond to that norm. The latter, to be sure, as the $\tau\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota$, "oder auch", "or else", points out, is the less frequent case. "Most frequently the inner

voice says: "That was bad!" Many times this voice steps forth as a defender & says: "No, it was good!" Good! "Despite the legal action of the Gentile world still with the single individual the principle business of the conscience shall consist in the accusation of his deeds." Philippi. From this characteristic of the testimony of the conscience it follows of itself how far the same proves the existence of the inner law. Even as far as it continually brings this law into application & applies to all the actions & omissions of man.

The foregoing Scriptural word Rom. 2, 14 ff. appears from of old in the Church, and, as we have seen, correctly as the principle reides of the article of the doctrine de lege naturali. What the apostle presents here, Körner gives very excellently with the following words: *Opus illud legis, quod in gentibus conspicitur haecque notitia honesti et turpis est ἐπεὶ οὐ τὸ θεῶν, ὅπου, Dei. Nam Deus, auctor naturae hanc cognoscendi, intelligendi, iudicandi et discernendi, facultatem mentibus aut cordibus hominum insinuat atque indidit; quae etsi post lapsum plurimum est obscurata, manserunt tamen adhuc reliquiae, hoc est notitiae et καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ φύσις, communes notiones in natura hominum, quae postea doctrinae disciplinaeque rursus sunt utique illustratae et in ecclesia voce verbi melius explicatae: haec sunt principia practica, ut emittam theoretica, monentia de Deo et honestis actionibus, quamvis etiam haec natura illis difficultus assentitur et parat Deinde hoc quoque legis probat nostris iudicium 5 v. 1. Et ἐπεὶ οὖν, conscientia, ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος, quae attestatur, quid recte et quid fiat. ... Sic conscientia, et ὁ νόμος, cogitationibus hominum, hoc est iudicio legis naturalis factis hominum nunc accensentur per κατὰ νόμον, ut proditis latinales, furta! Viris, desertis patrias & civitatis, nunc laudantur et defenduntur per ἐκ νόμου, ut factum Scipionis, qui hostis ponesam captivam illam reddidit, Milonius, qui rixam regulares dicitur. Luther illustrat the matter which is treated here in the following manner: "There is a two-fold knowledge of God. The one is called the knowledge of the Law, the other of the Gospel. For God has given us the two doctrines, the Law & the Gospel, so that one might know him from them. The knowledge from the Law the reason has recognized, & the reason has almost grasped & found out God. For it has seen from the Law what is right & wrong; & the Law is written in our heart, as a book. Paul testifies to the same. Although it has been given more clearly by Moses, still it is never the less true, that they know it is wrong to be disobedient to fathers & mother or the magistracy, to murder the same, to commit adultery, to steal, to curse, & to blaspheme;*

Therefore they have punished the transgressors of the Law, such as fornicators, murderers, & thieves, with more earnest punishment, than the Romans & other Gentiles. So many books have been written of that, & of the same murderers, thieves, & rogues & similar criminals, how they have taken them by the neck & have done to them as they have done to others, must confess before the judgment, that their mistreatment is certainly wrong. For their own conscience speaks: "That is not right"

that one slays another. For they have this statement from the Law of God & the Ten Commandments written in their hearts by nature, etc. St. Louis Ed., II, 1704. It is hereby left to be considered what Rörner also calls attention to, first, that that natural knowledge of the Law after the fall is darkened by sin, & then, that the communes notitiae in natura humana are illustrated & still better explained by the voice of the Word in the church, so that among those who have & hear the revealed Law at the same time, the voice of the natural Law & of the conscience ruled by the same gives the most distinct sound.

This traditional & almost generally accepted interpretation of our passage is also not shaken by the dissenses & the objections of some few theologians. Among the older ones it is especially Flaxinus, who resisted all the powers on the other hand, that Paul was supposed to speak here of a Law, which had really been written in the inner parts of the Gentiles, of all men by nature. He also took the words of the Apostle hypothetically, in the sense: If the Gentiles really do the works of the Law, which they do not do, then they would thereby prove that they are a Law unto themselves, that the work of the Law had been written in their heart, which is certainly not the case. That this explanation of the ἐν ἑαυτοῖς & the indicatives ἐν ἑαυτοῖς and ἐν συνείδησει is grammatically impossible, that such an assumed case can give no instance of proof, is very obvious. But even the motive, which Flaxinus designated for this absolutely unavailing exegesis, is also erroneous. He thinks that Paul, if he here spoke of an actually present inner Law, would contradict his other doctrine of the general human corruption, that such a Law in the heart would include in itself the bonitatem voluntatis. But this is not the case. And nothing is more perverted & more complicated than when modern theologians define the natural Law as a moral faculty ("sittliche Fähigkeit"). If the natural Law is something entirely otherwise than the moral quality, the moral conduct of man. The natural Law is a demand, a norm. If now the norm is good, it is not thereby said that the man also, to whom the norm is given, is good, that the moral conduct of man, his inner & outer conduct, corresponds to this norm. The conscience which is ruled by the lex naturalis, however, is a witness which judges the conduct of man, & if now the judgments of the conscience are correct, then it does not follow that man agrees also to such judgment from the heart, that man wills that which is right. "Conscience is not a thing which works there, but which only judges regarding the works." Luther. Even among infamies, who commit crimes out of evil, who with all the energy of their will resist the will of God, the conscience often exercises its function most energetically. In general it comes forth for the most part as the accuser of man & attests to him that he is evil & deals cruelly. But even if the conscience once defends man, even if Gentiles, unconverted men, once do that which is demanded by the Law, still the justitia civilis does not permit any exception from the common rule: By Adam's fall the human nature & essence are completely corrupted. For the justitia civilis is still no true fulfillment of the Law,

no obedience of the heart but is in itself only an outward thing & work, which also takes place there where man is destitute & empty of all fear of God & love to God, & which in no way makes the person good & pleasing before God.

Among the modern commentators, Klostermann, in his "Korrekturen zu der bisherigen Erklärung des Römerbriefs," has attacked the previous exegesis of Rom. 2, 14, 15 and has taken away the natural law & the natural conscience from the letter to the Romans. He refers *οἱ ἔθνη*, v. 15, back over v. 14 to *οἱ ἡμετέροις τοῦ νόμου*, v. 13, and finds in the statement of v. 15 a description of the obedience of the heart of the true doers of the Law, to whom their own conscience attests that they mean it earnestly & uprightly with the will of God, & this testimony of the good conscience also stands firm, in spite of the fact that they must often accuse themselves & make many complaints. The statement in v. 14 he takes as an anticipating confirmation of this truth with regard to the heathen, in that he understands *ἔθνη* to be the Gentile Christians & under the action of the same the correct Christian fulfillment of the Law: *Wir können ja immer mehr, als gezwungenen Konstruktion unmöglich beifügen* and have already remarked above, that word order & context exclude the very thoughts upon which Klostermann lays all importance.

It still comes to light that the *ἔθνη* with the law written in the heart means a law, a norm of the human conduct, similarly, as the Jews possessed it, & not the conduct of man over against the norm of the law. Nevertheless in one point one can be inclined to give place to corrector Klostermann. One can somewhat point the action of the Gentiles in conformity to the Law in v. 14 to the correct fulfillment of the Law, as it is found only among the Christians without urging upon the difference between *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τὰ τοῦ νόμου* and *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῦ νόμου*, as also Augustine & Micheliers have done. Surely one would not in the least alter the principle statement of the Apostle regarding the *lex naturalis*. It does not lie so far to combine the *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τὰ τοῦ νόμου* in v. 14 with the immediately preceding *οἱ ἡμετέροις τοῦ νόμου*, as to compare as parallel statements that which Paul had said in v. 2 and v. 10 regarding the doing of good, regarding the continuing in good works, which is ascribed even to the Gentiles, & that which he says in v. 27-29 concerning the flesh which fulfills the Law & which is circumcised in the heart. In the latter mentioned passages the Apostle evidently has converted Gentiles in mind, as the expression *ἔθνη* is very often used in a purely historical sense & also designates Gentile Christians as members of the nationality outside of Israel (cf. Rom.

4, 12, 15; 1, 13; 15, 9-12; 15, 16, 27; 16, 4. And even also this fact that the Gentiles, as soon as they have accepted the Gospel, prove their faith in good works & fulfill the demands of the Law, & this certainly in the correct manner, out of love to God, would give a proof for the existence of the natural law. For the Gentiles, when they are converted & now do good, follow first of all the light of nature, they know beforehand what is good & evil, & now they give practical proof of this knowledge also in

80.
2, 11-16.

works. And the teaching from the revealed Law, which they receive in the church, certainly does not extinguish the lumen naturale, but only kindles the same so much the more brightly. On the other hand, one must concede that in this context, where the apostle at the same time treats of the natural law ex professo, to be sure also the mention of the natural, civil righteousness is very much in place, & so we might at least know not to exclude the reference of v. 14a to the justitia civilis. Further at one time in the explanation of Rom 2, 14 includes both kinds of righteousness, the outward & the inner, when he writes: "certainly there then is no more in the natural law than the outward works, like the Jews' in Moses' Law, provided they fulfill the Law with the circumcision of the heart & judge the Jews, who are circumcised according to the flesh, vv. 26. 27." Walch, II, 2000.

Only incidentally is it still mentioned that Tene, in his document which is mentioned in the Introduction, p. 9 fff., holds that which the apostle here speaks concerning the natural law back to the Stoic philosophy. Certainly, regarding this law, which is engraved in the nature of all men, also the Greek philosophers have known & spoken something. Still it does not follow from this that Paul has taken this portion of his doctrine from heathen wisdom.

According to the foregoing we can now also answer the question, which we have left open above, namely, how the section 2, 14 fff. hangs together with the preceding, or how the yap in v. 14 is to be understood. The general rule contained in the statement of v. 13 is here in vv. 14. 15 confirmed with regard to the Gentiles. The modus rerum is the following: With God it does not depend upon the hearing but on the doing of the Law. v. 13. That applies in general. That certainly presumes a general acquaintance with the Law. That the Jews know the Law is beyond question. But that supposition is also found with the Gentiles. For if the Gentiles do not have the revealed written Law, they still have a substitute for it. They have the Law written in their hearts. They have the natural law. That is proven at once in the oft-recurring action of the Gentiles in conformity with the Law, & then above all in the incessant, common testimony & the varied judgments of their conscience.

But now in the foregoing section there is still added a designation of time, which has given the expositors much trouble: ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς ὅτε κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου. Siā 7. 760 v. κριῶ τοῦ, "and when I age, and when I will be rich and will do the Verborgene des Menschen nach meinem Evangelium durch Jesum Christum." "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." v. 16. That the conscience gives a testimony, the thoughts bring complaints & even accusations, evidently happens in this time, & therefore it would appear strange that the apostle draws this inner occurrence over to the day of judgment. Thus men have sought to escape this difficulty in various ways. Some, like Meyer & Rodet, after the example of ancient theologians,

81,
2, 11-16.

break v. 16 loose from the immediately preceding, take v. 14, 15 as a parenthesis, & connect
ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς, οἱ ἄλλοι etc. with οἱ ἄποστολοι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, v. 13, so that thus
it would only be said that the doors of the Law shall be justified on the day of judgment.
Still such a construction can belong only to the grammatical impossibilities. Others
understand the day on which God judges, in that they read ἡμεῖς, to be the present period
of grace & see in the conflict of thoughts in v. 15 an effect of the preaching of the Gospel. "That
day, on which God permits the message of the salvation of Christ to be proclaimed among the
heathen, shall become for all who hear it a day of inward judgment." There God treats the
inner parts of man through the Mediator of salvation, as all sins, & as all iniquities, & as all
which he finds in them, in order to move them thereby to acceptance of the proffered salvation. And
so the result of the divine judgment is that the Gentile, who sees the testimony of his conscience in agree-
ment with the judgment of God & sees himself accused by his own thoughts, gives the right to him
who judges him inwardly, & that he then proves by obedience over against the message of
salvation. Thus Hofmann, & similarly Lange & Otto. But "the day when God shall judge, ἡμεῖς,
or also "judges", ἡμεῖς, is still apparently identical with "the day of revelation of the righteous
judgment of God," v. 5, which stands before the eyes of the Gentile in this entire section;
& that inner striving of thoughts, v. 15, is not called forth first by the preaching of the Gospel,
but is set in motion when men come into opposition with the Law of God written in their inner
parts. There remains nothing else, the text obligates us, we must cut the testimony of the con-
science, the complaint & excuse of the thoughts in reference to the last day. Still not in this way,
that we look upon this entire inner action as an incident of the last day, as, for example,
Klostermann does, in that he joins ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς, οἱ ἄλλοι etc. to ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς, οἱ ἄλλοι etc. Much rather we
permit the above given explanation of the 15. verse to stand in their full circumstances, refer
the expressions of the same to the present time & take the reference of time in v. 16 as a supple-
mentary, loosely added modifier to καὶ ὑποποιστὸς ᾧ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Many
commentators, in order to arrange the sudden transition from the present to the future, insert
between v. 15 and v. 16 a supplementary gloss, such as "etiam scilicet, beocondo alio" or "und das
wird offenbar." Philippi, for example, paraphrases the meaning of Paul: "That the Gentiles
have a law written in their hearts is attested, other than by their legalistic action, by their
conscience & their thoughts, which alternately accuse or excuse even now, but especially
on the day of the final judgment." And Luthardt: "Now are these occurrences hidden, then on
the day of judgment, shall be revealed which secret ones have accused & admonished men." Never-
theless, the relation of this inner process to the day of judgment is not so much this that still on
that day the conscience carries out its office of witness to man, or that the hidden judgments

82.
2, 11-16

of the conscience shall only then be manifested, but consists much more in this, that this process then comes to an end & decision. And now take ἐν ᾧ περὶ οὗτοῦ etc. as a designation of the end of the judgment, by which the long business of judgment shall be completely executed, & no supplement is needed behind ἀποδοῦναι οὐδὲν, but only a short pause. The thoughts accuse & defend, & certainly on the day of judgment, in that they maintain their rights before the Judge of the world, succeed & effect the sentence of God. One might well have rather expected the expression ἐν τῇ ᾧ περὶ οὗτοῦ, as Luther also has translated, "in idem tag," etc., in that the judgments of the conscience aim at that day, but the apostle, in that he writes ἐν ᾧ περὶ οὗτοῦ, translates himself already in spirit to that terminus. It is certainly a very short elision & a free manner of speech, as sort of constructio ad sensum, that with the simple ἐν ᾧ περὶ οὗτοῦ the apostle adds the mention of the final end & the final result to the description of the process in v. 15. The matter conducts itself in this manner: The conscience gives testimony regarding the dealings of man, the thoughts bring accusations & excuses, & that takes place in this time, in the time of life, the process continues throughout the entire time of the world, throughout the entire history of mankind; but these accusations & apologies of the conscience likewise shall be made importunate at the tribunal of the final judgment & be decided on the day of judgment. The conscience accuses, resp. accuses man now already before God, & in the future the conscience man is again now & receives the voice of God. In that day, however, God shall speak the final word in this transaction. Then the Judge of the world shall deem all these accusations of the thoughts as correct & valid & publicly confirm the judgment which their own conscience has already spoken over the evil doers, & shall put it into effect. But He shall also respect the apologies of the conscience. To be sure, the works of the justitia civilis shall never deliver man from the future wrath, which he has deserved with his other disobedience. But a man, who has thus far lived honorably, has dealt justly, shall suffer fewer stripes than another, who has wasted away the time of his life dissolutely & has wantonly cast off from himself all the duties of earthly life. And finally also the righteous doers of the Law, who from the heart have been obedient to the demands of God which are written in the heart of man & revealed in the Word, shall see the testimony of their conscience confirmed upon that day & shall receive from God the recognition which men have denied to them here. And thus the natural Law, out of which the conscience begets its judgments, is them also a substitute for the written Law, insofar as with this (v. 12) it forms a norm of the final judgment.

The judgment of the last day the apostle now defines more closely, that on that day God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." τὰ κρυπτά τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ θεὸς κρίνει κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου. ἀντὶ τούτου ἀποκαλύπτει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτά τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἐπιστολαῖς. ἵνα ὑμεῖς ἴδητε τὸ τέλος τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἑσπερας. (Rom. 2:16-17)

But the Law written in the heart of man, the conscience & its judgments, which stand over against man as norm, witness, accuser, & defender, shall still not be judged, but on that day something only revealed; however, in our passage the discussion is concerning a $\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma\epsilon\iota\upsilon$, not concerning a $\phi\omega\tau\iota\varsigma\epsilon\iota\upsilon$, as, for example, in 1 Cor. 4, 5. Thus Philipp Meyer, & others understand "the secrets of men" with great right as "all in the inner & outer life, which is known to others either not at all or not according to its ethical nature." The meaning of Paul would then be this, that God on the day when He judges the secrets shall also bring to light those secret judgments of the conscience. This interpretation hangs closely together with the explanation of the following words. The expression $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\nu\upsilon\omega$ creates no difficulty in the sense "in accordance with Evangelium" or "but" (according to, in consequence of, in view of Evangelium). Biedt to. 8. 17 $\nu\omega\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ one only remarks that the Longitudes also otherwise designate Christ as the Judge of the world, for example, John 5, 22; Acts 17, 31; 1 Cor. 4, 5; 11 Cor. 5, 10; 1 Tim. 4, 1. But that God shall judge, & that He shall judge thru Christ, "that was," to speak with Meyer, "certainly so generally known & so completely unquestioned that the addition in this sense would have been very unnecessary, if then also the $\nu\omega\upsilon$ would be without a dramatic meaning, since no one

claimers of the Gospel could dispute that truth." But how often Paul's theme mentions the final judgment in his letters, without pointing out that this also belongs to the content of his Gospel, that he was accustomed to teach thus. The $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ with $\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ connects the expression, that it, similarly as in 2, 6, should mention the norm, the judgment, and as then also Calov, Meyer, & Hofmann take "the Gospel" here as the norm, the judgment, and this interpretation then gives the character to the entire sentence. It is a custom of the Apostle, that often in a relative clause, which closely joins itself to the foregoing, he introduces a new and important thought into the discussion. "The Pauline logic loves to add on, always one on the other, & certainly to the immediately preceding, & to spin the thread further in such dialectic development. Thus it comes that subordinate members of the logical arrangement sometimes bring thoughts of greater importance, which the Epistle only expresses thus in passing, without making them the real object of his doctrinal presentation in the respective place."

Luthardt. Thus in our passage, in that he returns to the principal theme of this section of the discussion, the Epistle brings forth this new & final instance, that God shall judge men according to the Gospel which is preached & thru Jesus Christ, of whom his Gospel spoke. In thereby expressing nothing else than what the Lord himself had uttered previously: "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John 12, 48. "But God shall judge according to the Gospel" does not contradict that which Paul had spoken previously, regarding that, that God shall judge & reward according to works. The real decision concerning salvation

84.
2, 11-16.

& condemnation God shall take according to the measure of the Gospel, which depends on how a man has placed himself over against the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Mediator of salvation, whether or not he has accepted the Gospel & the salvation in Christ in faith. Concerning that shall Jesus Christ, the Savior of men, ask above all, when He judges men by the order of God. For this position of the heart to the Gospel, to Christ, & thereby to God, τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "the secrets of men," is then a very fitting designation. Now, however, the faith of the heart expresses & proves itself necessarily in good works, in the fulfillment of the Law: and thus the Judge on that day shall also ask & search out according to work & conduct, & shall measure the works of men according to the Law, which He has written in the hearts of all men & thus has revealed in the Word. The Gospel is the norm for the real decision over death or life. Law & works are the norm for the public judgment, which the Judge shall deliver on the day of judgment before all the world & whereby He motivates His decision of men. Thereby the Epistle at the close of this section of the discussion itself points to this connection between faith & works, which we have presented in the complex of the scriptural doctrine. And even this statement then forms a very solemn conclusion to the entire discussion regarding the judgment of the last day, which had begun in 2, 6.

On that we look back to the section 2, 6-16, we picture to ourselves once again in short the principle thoughts of the same & the connection of thoughts.

From 4, 18 on the Apostle had set forth that all mankind, above all the Gentile world, lay in condemnation, iniquity before God & fallen under wrath, that especially the slack judges of morals, who do even that which they criticize in others, shall not escape the final judgment. And now, after he had spoken more in general regarding the future wrath & judgment he looks in concrete at the day of wrath & righteous judgment of God & follows with a description of the final judgment in that he more closely demonstrates that God shall judge justly & impartially on that day. He shall reward everyone according to his works, & thereby makes no difference between Jews & Gentiles, shall not take into consideration the outward prerogative of the Jews, the outward possession of the Law. To be sure, the Law of God, this eternally valid norm for the conduct of man, shall form the standard of the judgment of God, & God shall sentence Jews & Gentiles, all men, according to the Law. Likewise the Gentiles. For if the Gentiles also do not possess the revealed & written Law, still the Law has been written in their hearts, as especially the testimony of the conscience proves this. No, also the natural law is a norm of the judgment. The judgments of the conscience, accusations & excuses, likewise, agreed to the forum of the final judgment. But with God it does not depend on the mere hearing & knowing of the Law, but on the doing of the Law. Above all, the Apostle, in conformity with the tendency of the entire presentation from 1, 18 on, calls attention to the condemnatory judgment of God. Those who sin & do evil shall be judged & shall fall to wrath & eternal condemnation. Nevertheless

in that he would draw a complete picture of the final judgment, he also does not leave the other side unmentioned, which also proves the right verities of the divine judgment. Those who do good & fulfill the Law shall receive a favorable judgment & eternal life. At the close of this discussion Paul still reveals that the final decision over death & life lies in the Gospel. Now the Gospel alone & faith in the Gospel alone makes man capable of good works & of the fulfillment of the Law. The principle sum of the section is this:

God shall reward everyone, Jews & Gentiles, impartially according to his works. For with Him it does not depend on the knowledge, but on the doing of the Law.

E, 17-29. The Severe Fault of the Jews.

W, 17-24.

Already in the previous section, which treated of the impartial judgment of God the Apostle had placed the Gentiles at the side of the Jews. And after he had come to an understanding with the Gentiles in 1, 18-25, he now takes to task the Jews especially. He begins his reprimand of the Jews with the words: "Wenn du aber Jude genannt wirst". "Behold, thou art called a Jew", Εἰ σὺ οἶς Ἰουδαῖος, ἔτι ποῦ τίς. In his own speech here, as in E, 1-5, he takes one out of the class of men with whom he is dealing, & holds up to him what he has to say to the entire group. With most of the commentators we follow the more affected reading Εἰ σὺ, "Wenn du aber". The other reading ἴσθι or ἴσθις, "Siehe", has arisen either through Taciturnus or probably a corrector proposed on behalf of the alteration of the structure. First of all we look away from the construction of the sentence & acquaint ourselves with the content of the individual statements. Thus the Apostle, who was called a Jew by others & gladly called himself thus, here dealt with the Jews. The verb Εἰς ποῦ τίς is often in classical Greek means "men", "benennen", & does not necessarily designate the surname. Since the return from the Babylonian Exile Ἰουδαῖος was the name of the entire people of Israel & at the same time a name of honor for distinction from the Greeks. The Jew boasted of that which he had in advantage over the Gentiles: "Thou reatest in the Law, & makest thy boast of God." i. e. Those were real prerogatives of the Jews. To the Jews the true living God had revealed himself, while the Gentiles lived without God in the world, Eph. 2, 12. & had revealed His Law to them. The expression Εἰς ποῦ τίς nevertheless designates at the same time the trust of the Jews on their God & their Law as a fully certainty. The Jews leaned & relied on the outward possession of the Law & thought that it set them secure with God. The following statement names further prerogatives, & certainly subjective prerogatives, privileges of the Jews, which resulted from the possession of the Law. The Jews, because they were

instructed out of the Law, knew the will, τὸ θεῖον, the absolute will, which ordains all things, self-evidently God's will, & therefore they were also capable of proving the difference, the difference between right & wrong. Thus according to Phil. 1, 10 we take ἐκρίψαι τὰς ἁγίας διαφόρους, "du prüfst das Unterschiedene," & not in the more distant lying meaning, "du billigst das Vorgügliche" (as in the H.V.: "approvest the things that are more excellent"). This better knowledge of their own gives the Jews an advantage over against others. They offered themselves as leaders & teachers to the blind, darkened Gentiles: "trau' dir auch zu, ein Führer der Blinden zu sein, ein Licht derer in Finsternis, ein Erzieher der Unverständigen" ("thou art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish"), from whom the correct understanding of good & evil proceeds, "ein Lehrer der Unmündigen" ("a teacher of babes"), those incapable of judgment, "indem du die Gestalt der Erkenntnis und der Wahrheit am Besten besitzt" ("which best the form of knowledge & of the truth in the law"), v. 19. 20. In the revealed Law the Jews possessed the $\mu\omega\sigma\alpha\iota\sigma$, the real form, display of the knowledge & the truth, both to be understood subjectively, insofar as they had to do with the will of God. In the Mosaic Law the Jews had the full, adequate expression of the divine will, while the natural law, which is also written in the hearts of the Gentiles, was really obscured & garbled through sin. And so the Jews were also called upon to teach others, the ignorant, unwise Gentiles, "whose foolish heart was darkened," Rom. 1, 21, whose moral concepts were confused concerning the true God & to clarify His good & holy will: & they also gladly undertook the role of teachers & saviors. Such readiness & confidence in the teaching of His, however, is characterized by the expression $\pi\epsilon\pi\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, as well as by the heaped up designations of the same matter at the same time as arrogant self-confidence & presumption. Here the picture of a genuine Pharisaically minded Jew is presented to us.

Paul continues in v. 21: $\delta\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\iota\beta\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\iota\varsigma\delta\epsilon\varsigma\iota\varsigma\delta\alpha\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, "du du einen andern lehrst, lehrst dich selber nicht" ("Thou therefore which teachest another, thou teachest thou not thyself?"). With the $\epsilon\pi\alpha\mu\lambda\eta\tau\iota\kappa\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\delta\upsilon$, which belongs to the subject, not to the predicate of the sentence, he again takes up the previous statement & combines them into one expression: $\delta\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon$. The Jews pretended to teach others, as certainly the possession of the revealed Law also enabled them to do. Now, however, with such a claim their own conduct over against the Law stood in sharp contrast. They did not teach themselves, they did not judge themselves in the least according to that which they taught others & presented as truth. They preached that one should not steal, and still they stole themselves. v. 21b. "Thief included in itself all the injustices & cheatings, of which the Jews permitted themselves to become guilty in their business dealings." Solet. They said that one should not commit adultery, & still they themselves committed adultery. v. 22a. "Adultery is one transgression which the Talmud shows among the three most famous rabbis, Hillel, Mekhil, & Elazar.

Renewal is one of the most glaring characteristics of the Semites. *Exod. 32* they debased the idols & still they committed sacrilege. *122b*. Most modern exegesis refers *Exod. 32:15* to the robbery of heathen idol temples, & *Exod. 32:15* formulates the contract to this: "you have an aversion to the idols, but your aversion of idolatry does not go so far that it hinders you from contemplating the valuable things which are used in idol worship, when you can make them your own, as good booty." But that the robbery of temples in the heathen sense of the word was found among the Jews cannot be proven with certainty. And if it did happen now & then, still the mention of such isolated cases does not fit into this passage, where Paul uncovers & criticizes the common moral wrongs of Judaism. *Such würde der Apostel schwerlich einem Juden, der die heidnischen Götzen für nichts achtete und mit Recht die Beraubung des Götzentempels als sacrilegium angesehen haben, sondern höchstens als gemeine Dieberei.* Therefore with Hofmann, Hodge, & ancient commentators we understand under the *Exod. 32:15* the robbery of the Jewish Temple, which had been consecrated to the true, living God. But it also passes as robbery of the Temple according to *Mal. 3:8-10*, when the Jews withheld from the Lord his Temple the due sacrifices & tithes. And that was a common crime of the Phariseally directed Jews, & not only a proof of general avarice, but above all a proof for the fact that they despised the Lord's Temple.

And what a contradiction that was! The Jews debased the idols of the heathen, declaimed passionately against the worship of idols, as they presumed out of holiness for the Lord's honor & his house, & still they actually robbed, devastated, & despised the house of the Lord. "*Lehmm ist es, wenn er, nämlich der Jude, ... die Götzen für brüßl achtet, als ob ihm der Ruin seines Gottesheilig sei, dabei aber das Heiligtum, das es für ihn selbst ist, nicht heidnische Tempel, beraubt, indem er es an dem verkürzt, was er ihm schuldet.*" Hofmann's. Hodge remarks on *Exod. 32:15*: "It expresses the sin of irreverence in its higher forms; either as manifested in withholding from God his due, which the prophet denounces as robbery, ... or it may be taken in the still more general sense of profanation, the irreverent disregard of God's holy things. This is all the text requires: you profess great reverence for God, in eschewing idolatry; & yet, in other forms, you are guilty of the greatest irreverence." Accordingly the apostle lays this threshold transgression to the charge of the Jews, as to the Gentiles, iniquity over against their own bodies, uncharity, wronging of the neighbor, & crime against God. *Gengel: Atrocissime peccata in proximum, te ipsum, Deum. Ad gentes Paulus ostendit peccata, primum contra Deum, deinde contra*

De, deinde contra alios, nunc ordinem in vertit: nam peccata contra Deum in gentibus apertissima sunt, in Iudaeis non item. Still the transgression of the Jews is much more serious than that of the Gentiles, also than that of those by societal judges of morals, & 1-5, because the Jews adorned & covered their godlessness & unrighteousness with God's word & Law. To teach others, God's word & still to do the opposite of that which one teaches others in

still worse than to judge & criticize another for that which one does himself. In that he combines the separate transgressions of the Jews, the apostle closes this description of morals with the words: "Wenn du das Gesetz als dich rühmst, verunehret Gott durch die Übertretung des Gesetzes; denn der Name Gottes wird um eurer willen gelästert unter den Heiden, wie geschrieben steht" (1. "Thou that makest thy boast of the law, thou breaking the law dishonorest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written").

V. 23 & 24. The last words are taken according to form from Isa. 52, 5, according to content from Ezek. 36, 20-23. In the latter passage the Jews are criticized, because through their exile, the necessary result of their sins, they gave the Gentiles occasion for the abuse of the glory & power of Jehovah, as if He had not been able to protect His people. In our passage Paul calls attention to the fact that through their godless, unholy conduct the Jews caused the Gentiles to abuse the name of God, in that they placed the sins of the Jews to the account of the God of the Jews, as if God Himself through His Law trained & instructed His people for such objectionable conduct. That καὶ οὖν, γὰρ, παρὰ τὰ, which otherwise, when a formal quotation of Scripture is introduced, is always placed before, here stands at the end of the sentence, shows that Paul here only adapted a word of Scripture & has only used it for his purpose. The foregoing criticism of the hypocrite, moreover, also applies to all hypocrites among the Christians who boast of the Christian name & the pure teaching of the divine Word, but with their conduct, even also unchristian in business & labor of their hands, sins of the flesh of all kinds, robbery of their sanctuary, withholding of their gifts and sacrifices, & the like, contradict the teachings of the divine Word & thus give cause to the unbelievers to ridicule & blaspheme Christianity & the God of the Christians.

What now concerns the construction of this long section, there is the question, Where does this protasis, which begins with Ἐὰν, v. 17, have its apodosis, & Is there an apodosis? Schott peronitz the apodosis to begin already in v. 17. Meyer, Weiss, Philippi, & others in v. 21, in that they take the statements in v. 21 & 22 as questions. Hofmann & Othard take v. 23. The first assumption presents a completely steric hypothesis: "Wenn du ein Jude bist, so tust du dich doch nicht auf das Gesetz an, auch rühmst du dich Gottes", and it is forced, in this long discourse of the two statements combined with καὶ, to take the first two καὶ in the sense of "sowohl - als auch." Against the second assumption it speaks that still the illegal action of the Jews cannot be inferred from the possession of the Law. The concise sense of the discussion would then be this: When you teach others, you still do not teach yourselves. The conclusion must much rather read: If you have the Law & teach others, why do you transgress the Law & do not teach yourselves? With the third assumption it does not agree that the statement of this 2. verse is similar to the foregoing, as this describes the illegal action of the Jews. Against the second & third

assumptions it is to be asserted above all, that according to that the evil conduct of the Jews would be the principle content & goal of the discussion. And that does not harmonize with the parallel statements of the apostle in 1, 19-32 and 2, 1-5. There he directs not only the moral corruption of the Gentile world, but calls attention to & emphasizes the fact that the Gentiles with their sins draw down upon themselves the wrath of God, that the heathen moralists & judges of morals shall not escape the judgment of God, & then there follows in 2, 3-16 a detailed description of the impartial judgment of God, which shall come upon all the transgressors of the Law, Gentiles & Jews. We find room for a similar thought in our passage, when with Rom 8 & 10 it is taken the entire sentence structure, vv. 17-24, as a parenthesis & taken for granted as anacoluthon, in that the apostrophe supplies itself of itself. Here the situation is produced that certain unquestionable facta are expressed in conditional forms, in order to conclude something else out of the same. The meaning of Paul is: You, a Jew, have the Law, you know the will of God & teach others, but thereby you do not teach yourself, but much rather you transgress the Law & dishonor your God. But if that is so, as is really the case - then what follows? Now evidently, that you least of all shall escape the judgment & wrath of God. In conformity with that Rom 8 supplies the apostrophe behind v. 24: *exalta, quanto graviores poenae tibi sunt metuendae.* And Kodel: "Wo zu wird der dieneas bestrafte, dieneas, dieneas du dich bei dem Anderen rühmet und das du selbst so froch übertrittet?" Only to condemnation.

2, 25-29.

There follows here a statement regarding circumcision. This is introduced with *et* and serves for the confirmation of the foregoing amplification. Paul had shown that a Jew who transgressed the Law would not escape the judgment of God. This statement continues in force. For circumcision also does not alter anything in that. Circumcision in itself does not save the Jews from wrath. The concept "Bekehrung", *μετάνοια*, is very strongly brought to prominence by the elliptical *we*, to which no *et* corresponds. The Jews boasted of & trusted, as on the possession of the Law, so also in the circumcision, & thought that no evil could befall them, because they were circumcised. Rabbinical proverb reads: *Quandoquidem circumcisus sumus, in infernum non descendimus.* "Jeder Bekehrte hat 'heil' und ist gütlicher Reich." But circumcision is of use only then - that the apostle gives to the Jew, who is proud of his circumcision, first of all, v. 25, to consider - "wenn du das Gesetz hast" - "if thou keep the Law". The significance, the advantage of circumcision consists therein, that it makes the one who is circumcised a member of the people of God & gives him a claim to all the blessings of the people of God. But only then, when upon circumcision there follows the fulfillment of the Law. Circumcision obli-

ated the Jews to obedience over against the Law. "Every man that is circumcised... is a debtor to do the whole law." Gal. 5: 3. If on the other hand, the Jew is a transgressor of the Law, then circumcision is of no use to him, then his circumcision has become a foreskin, then he appears before God as no more than a lost, lost away Gentile. From this there follows the reverse side, v. 6, that when the foreskin, abstractum pro concreto, that is, an uncircumcised Gentile, observes the legal demands or the statements of the Law, to him his foreskin is accounted as circumcision, so that he then appears before God as a member of the congregation of God. The future, v. 16 by 6: 7a1 is, like the following, v. 16: 1, the so-called logical future, which presents that which takes place in a legal case. The following sentence, v. 27, we take "assertorisch": "Und es wird nicht die natürliche Unbeschnitttheit," the by nature uncircumcised, impure Gentile, "die das Gesetz erfüllt, dich, der du bei (Si) Buchstaben und Beschneidung ein Übertreter des Gesetzes bist!" ("And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter & circumcision dost transgress the law?" H.V.). The Si here, as often, designates the accompanying circumstances. There is not meant a judgment & sentence with words, but that which takes place de facto. A Gentile who fulfills the Law, even therewith, in that he is obedient to the Law & thus gives it right, comparative sui, (brother), actually puts in his place the Jew who transgresses the Law as guilty & punishable. That the Jew acts contrary to the Law, in spite of the fact that he has it written in letters before his eyes, & by circumcision is made subject to the Law, only increases his guilt. When the Apôtles speak of the Gentiles who fulfill the Law, then that is no abstract possibility, no fictio historica. Coloss. 1: 11, the "Ede", v. 26, establishes a situation which often takes place. And the Gentile who judges the Jew is a real person. Certainly with the expressions τὰ Σικαϊσιν τὰ τοῦ νόμου φιλῶσιν and τὸ νόμον ἰεῖδεν the true obedience of the Law, is described, of which no Gentile is capable by nature, as it is found only among Christians, who have the Spirit of God. Rom. 8: 4: 12, 8. But Paul has in mind here even the Gentiles who have become Christians, archetypus in Christianis, Körner. Koales Meyer & Godet. Only here he does not mention expressly how an uncircumcised comes to such obedience, in that he reserves this for later exposition, but simply calls attention to the fact that Gentiles, who are by nature uncircumcised, without becoming Jews & permitting themselves to be circumcised, still fulfill the Law, observe the legal demands of the Law.

The following statement, introduced with γὰρ, justifies the principle statement, that circumcision itself is not necessary, according to another side. In the first of the two statements, v. 28, the subject is supplied out of the predicate, in the second the predicate is to be taken out of the subject. The meaning is: "Nicht der es offenbar, augenfälliger Weise ist, der ist in Wahrheit ein Jude und nicht die offenbar Weise, am Fleisch geschieht, ist in Wirklichkeit Beschneidung." (H.V.): "For he is not a Jew, which is outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward."

in the flesh? Much rather: He who is so in a hidden manner, inwardly, is so in truth, a member of the people of God; & this is more closely clarified in the second part of the sentence: Circumcision of the heart in spirit, not letters, is circumcision in truth, makes man a member of the congregation of God. Yes, such a man, who is circumcised in heart, has his praise not of man but of God. The circumcision in the flesh reminds & admonishes the Israelites of the circumcision of the heart, that they should cut away the uncircumcised inclinations & desires of their natural hearts & cleanse their hearts of disobedience, obstinacy, of evil lusts & desires. "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, & be ^{no} more stiff-necked." Deut. 10, 16. The inner circumcision takes place, however, not by the letters of the Law, as the physical circumcision, since one fulfils that which is demanded according to the letters of the Law in the body of another, but by the Spirit, by the power of the Spirit of God. Moses already presented circumcision of the heart as a work of God: "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart." Deut. 10, 16. (cf. John 5, 44; 12, 43.) It is the Spirit of God who renews and cleanses the heart of man & gives power to the reborn for his own sanctification. Whoever is thus circumcised inwardly, in the heart, who is born anew by the Spirit of God, be he Jew or Gentile, appears before God as circumcised, is looked upon by God as a member of His Church. Out of the

Circumcision of the heart there follows & flows then also the true obedience to the Law, concerning which the discussion was, previously. Thus the type gives the proud Jew to consider that his circumcision has no merit before God & also helps him naught in the judgment, if circumcision of the heart & obedience to the Law are not bound together with it. Something similar is said to Baptism as to circumcision, the sacrament of the Old Covenant. The significance of Baptism consists therein, that Baptism leads man into the Church of God, & makes him a child of God & that it at the same time regenerates him, as a washing of regeneration & renewing of the Holy Ghost, & obligates him to & makes him capable of a holy, divine life & conduct. But now whoever boasts of & trusts in his Baptism & thereby denies the new birth, faith, & obedience over against God, shall not be saved from the wrath of God by his Baptism.

Summary: The Jews, who boast of the Law & teach others therewith & still transgress the Law, have the greatest guilt; they shall have to suffer the severest punishment. Even circumcision helps them naught in the judgment; for the outward circumcision in the flesh in itself has no merit before God, but only the circumcision of the heart, which then proves itself in the fulfillment of the Law.

Chapter III.

III, 1-8. That the Law of Man Finally Serves for the Glory of God Does Not Remove Its Guilty Character.

3, 1-4.

The Apostle now raises the question, according to the statements as to what sort of an advantage remains for the Jews. The connection of the statement in 3, 1 to the foregoing, which is shown by the particle of deduction, οὖν, Galow explains very aptly in the words: *Si non minus, Iudei, quam gentiles sub condemnatione sunt, ne peccati, quod demonstrat apostolus, quid ergo praecipui salient Iudei, prae gentibus? et quae est circumcisionis utilitas?* To T. E. 91060. v. 12, *quod inuaper est*, the advantage. The second question is subordinated to the first & describes essentially the same thing. Circumcision makes even the Jew a Jew. The answer to that question reads: To οὖν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὑπὸ παντός, "Einvielfacher in jeder Hinsicht." V. 2. The advantage of the Jews over the Gentiles reached every relationship of life. Later, in 9, 1 ff., Paul enumerates, in another connection, a series of such prerogatives of Israel. Here he is satisfied to name the principle advantage: *Ver Allen namlich*, "thus we best take the ὑπὸ παντός καὶ ἄλλῃ, *dass sie beinahe wurden mit den gesprochen Worten*" ("much, every way; chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God"). God Himself had entrusted to them His λόγια, as a highest good. Τα λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ in profane Greek are the sayings, the statements of the divinity, oracula, in the scriptures, the statements, the revelations of the true, living God, ἡ ἀληθεύς καὶ ἐμὲν βέντας (very custom). In the Septuagint this expression is a translation of the Hebrew: 3. 7. 7. 15, and is used of prophecy, as, for example, God gave such to Balaam, Num. 24, 4, as well as of the Law of God, Ps. 107, 11. In the New Testament the Law of Moses, Luke 2, 38, the Gospel of Christ, Heb. 5, 12, God's Word in general, 1 Pet. 4, 11, are called λόγια Θεοῦ. In our passage this designation embraces all statements, revelations of God, which were imparted to Israel & which are recorded in the Old Testament Scriptures, both the Law & the promises, but not at the same time, as Hofmann would have it, the New Testament message of salvation. For first with the Νῦν δὲ, v. 21, "begins the description of the Christian period" (Philippi), or, as we would rather say, of the Christian condition of things. In that God entrusted these λόγια of His to Israel, He has established Israel in this special relationship to Himself, that He was Israel's God & Israel was His people.

What the Apostle had said concerning the advantage of the Jews, he maintains in v. 3, 4 over against a possible objection. He continues: To γὰρ εἰ ἂν ἴστωσαν τινες, μὴ ὅτι ἀπιστία αὐτῶν ὅτι ἀπιστία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ὑποψία; 14 ἢ ἐἴοιτο. "Denn wie?" "For how does the situation lie?" "Wenn Etliche untreu waren, so wird ihre Untreue doch nicht die Treue Gottes zu nichte machen?" ("For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God

without effect.?) Meyer, Weiss, Bodet, & even ancient commentators understand under the

2 Tim. 3:18 of the Jews their unbelief, which they set over against the preaching of Christ & of the apostles. But in this entire context, as Philippi correctly remarks, Paul characterizes Jewry in itself, still looking away from their position to the Gospel. And the expressions 2 Tim. 3:18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000

reward unbelief with unfaithfulness. And with the $\gamma' \epsilon' \iota' \varsigma$ $\tau' \omega$, $\nu' \epsilon'$, $\epsilon' \pi' \epsilon' \tau' \epsilon'$ 11, Gen. 4:13; Josh. 22:29, "bott beute!", "God beware!", "Das sei fern!", "God forbid!", this strongest form of negation, the apostle energetically points back to this thought. No, God has maintained faithfulness with the faithless, He has, when Israel did not believe & obey His Word, not broken His relationship to Israel immediately, has not withdrawn His Law & His promises, has also spoken further to the unfaithful, disobedient people thru His prophets, has continually reminded the apostates of His Law thru the mouths of the prophets, has warned & punished & charmed & enticed them with His promises, until these had been fulfilled in Christ.

The unbelief of Israel does not annul the faithfulness of God. "Es werde nicht mehr Gott wahrhaftig, jeder Mensch aber ein Lügner!" ("yea, let God be true, but every man a liar.") According to the apostle's wish & God's will it shall & should terminate in that way, that God is true, but man is a liar. We have no need of changing the $\gamma' \nu' \epsilon' \iota' \varsigma$ $\tau' \omega$ into $\delta' \alpha' \nu' \epsilon' \rho' \omega' \varsigma$ $\epsilon' \alpha' \lambda' \omega' \varsigma$ & $\tau' \omega$ $\epsilon' \sigma' \tau' \epsilon' \iota' \varsigma$ $\nu' \epsilon' \epsilon' \alpha' \lambda' \omega' \varsigma$, but let it remain in its usual meaning. Since the misunderstanding that the apostle wishes that God would be true, because He is still not that, & man would be a liar, if he is not one yet, remains

excluded of itself, therefore he can express himself as he does, in order to say that it should terminate in such a way that it is so. God is true, every man, on the other hand, is a liar, that should be the final facts in the case. In this sense the apostle means the development, not as if he presented God's truthfulness & man's untruthfulness as something still not in existence, but so, that the actuality of the one & of the other was not only known to him beforehand & recognized as

certain, but the final result given by him of all this is what passes between God & man. "Hofmann. First of all it treats of the special relationship of God to Israel. That shall & should be the final result of the history that has passed between God & the Jews, that God stands as the true One, as the One who has remained with His words, however, the Jews as liars, as those who have turned away from the words of God. The truthfulness of God covers itself here with His faithfulness, & the lying of man with the unbelief of the Jews. Thus that objective advantage of the Jews remains steadfast, in spite of their unbelief, but he establishes no subjective advantage for the unfaithful ones, in that God's faithfulness & truthfulness, according to which God has also maintained His *hoyix* upright over against the faithless ones, rather places their unfaithfulness & lying, more glaringly in the light.

But it reads *נא; עֵי אִי אָנֹכִי; וְעֵי כָל אָדָם; יָדַעַם מֶנְשֶׁחָבֶר עִין לִגְוֹנִי* ("that every man a liar"). Still more in general, not only the Jews, also the heathens shall finally come to stand before God as liars. Because the Lord here generalizes his statement & what he has said regarding the Jews, but now extends over the entire generation of man, he introduces the expressions *אָדָם; וְכָל אָדָם;* and *וְעֵי כָל אָדָם;* which have a wider range of concept than *נא; עֵי אִי אָנֹכִי;* and *עֵי כָל אָדָם;*. All men are liars, as we also read this in Ps. 116, 11. The Gentiles certainly did without that good which the Jews had in advantage over them, the *hoyix* too. But God had not left Himself unrecognized among them. He had manifested Himself His eternal power & divinity to them in the works of creation, as in the works of the preservation of the world. He had given them, all men, to know His *Si xixi-wix;* had written His Law in their hearts. 1, 19. 20. 32; 2, 4. 14. 15. But the Gentiles, men in general, honor Him not as God & do not thank Him; they suppress the truth through unrighteousness with their evil works they deny the better moral knowledge, do not permit themselves to be led to repentance by the goodness of God. Thus, they are altogether liars. For *וְעֵי כָל אָדָם;* is, *quia a veritate recedit*, Körner, "whoever has stood in opposition to the truth." Hofmann. "In the scriptures the lie designates the inner falseness, by virtue of which the human heart resists the known, understood moral good." Kodel. Still the lying of men does not destroy the truthfulness of God. God shows Himself also over against the liars, always as *אֱלֹהִים;* "wahrhaftig," *sibi constans*. He attests Himself constantly to sinful, lying mankind on the created sphere & in their conscience, admonishes, warns, punishes them in their conscience, manifests to them His creator love & good in the benefits of the daily life, lets them experience the riches of His divine goodness, patience, & long suffering. And thus the final result of this history shall be, which presents itself between God & man: God is true, but every man is a liar. God has overlooked nothing, has permitted nothing to be lacking over against man, has sent it only good & truthful will, every man, has dealt only justly. But man has neglected it, has cheated & disappointed God, all guilt lies on man. And in view of the purity & truthfulness of God the lie, the guilt of man appears only so much the greater.

Every man shall finally stand as a liar before God, none excepted. Thus also the believers from among the Jews & Gentiles, who by nature are also altogether sinners & liars. The Epistle here looks away from the fact, how the grace of God in Christ has changed the relationship between God & man. Nevertheless this final result in the destiny of man shall not be basically destroyed through faith & the grace of Jesus Christ, much rather shall it be established. When God now & in the future looks upon the believers as just & declares them so out of grace for Christ's sake, then He thereby substantiates the fact that they are sinners & unrighteous ones on their part. And when the believers now & in the future take their refuge in the grace of God & would be justified & saved through Christ, through the merits of Christ, then they thereby present themselves before God as sinners & transgressors. Cf. Gal. 2, 17.

The Epistle still produces a Scripture passage, Ps. 51, 4, for the corroboration of this statement. The quoted words run thus in the Hebrew: $\text{אֲנִי צָדִיק וְיָשָׁר בְּעֵינֵי ה' וְיָשָׁר בְּעֵינֵי ה' וְיָשָׁר בְּעֵינֵי ה' וְיָשָׁר בְּעֵינֵי ה'}$. That means: "Damit du gerecht siehst bei deinem Reden, rein siehst bei deinem Richter." Paul adopts the translation of the Septuagint, which offers a essentially the same sense: $\delta\iota\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\iota\chi\alpha\iota \omega\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \nu\iota\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\nu \tau\omega \kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\epsilon \theta\alpha\iota$. "damit du gerecht siehst in deinen Worten und übergeest, wenn du richtest" ("That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, & mightest overcome when thou art judged"). $\kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\epsilon \theta\alpha\iota$ is here to be taken mediately, even as $\sigma\iota\chi\alpha\iota \omega\tau\eta\varsigma$ and $\nu\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, "überlegen", overcome, in sensu forensi. This Psalm quotation also places before our eyes the end of history & the final judgment. When in the future God speaks with many judges him concerning his conduct, then will He be right in the end. He shall overcome him; it will prove itself that God has not harmed man, has shown him only good & benevolence, that on the other hand, man has offended God, has broken truth & faith with him. And thus shall God overcome, shall stand as pure, innocent, & just, when He speaks His sentence of judgment upon man, when He gives His judgment that he has deserved death & condemnation. And that it comes about, thus is God's will & purpose. It reads in Ps. 51, 4a: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, & done this evil in thy sight, & to thee is added the purpose clause: "that thou mightest be justified," etc. With the sin of man it is thus aimed at the fact that God is divinely right in the end & overcomes. Sin takes place against God's will, is an abomination to God. Still when man does even that which is evil in the eyes of God, then it is God's will & purpose that he justifies God with his sin. God does not will the evil, but, in case man does evil as a purpose, He wills even this effect of the evil. "One dare not thereby weaken this אֲנִי צָדִיק , that one understands it of result instead of purpose. But it is meant intentionally, thus it joins itself to the moral relationship of man to God, as it is expressed in the אֲנִי צָדִיק and אֲנִי צָדִיק , which applies to the fact that God, when He now judges the sinner, appears as the righteous & holy One, who, as the sinner himself must acknowledge, can decree nothing else

96.
3, 5-8.

than to condemn him." Delitzsch. The condition, that whoever sins, whatever sin it might be, always sins against God & does that which is evil in the eyes of God serves to this end & should serve to this end, that God appears at the same time as the offended party against whom injustice has taken place & who acts justly when He judges & punishes the sinner.

3, 5-8.

With the metabatical St Paul leads over to a new series of thoughts. With the words: "Wenn aber unsere Ungerechtigkeit Gottes Gerechtigkeit erweist" ("But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God"), 6 v v 16, 17, he again takes up what he had said before, in order to draw a conclusion from it. The expressions ἀδικία and δικαιοσύνη are occasioned by the δικαιοσύνη in the Psalm quotation. "The injustice (ἀδικία) of man is the general concept, but belong his unbelief & lying disposition as species, even as the justice (δικαιοσύνη) of God is the genus, to which His trustworthiness & truth are 'subsumit' as species." Thus Philippi. We would rather designate the relationship of this concept to another: The entire conduct of man toward God, which had previously been characterized specially as unfaithfulness & falseness, is here designated with the general appellation ἀδικία; the entire conduct of God toward man, which had previously been placed under the special point of view of faithfulness & truth is here covered with the general name δικαιοσύνη. The ἀδικία of man is their "Unrecht", their abnormal moral nature; θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη is God's justice, "God is without fault, just as He must be. Wiser. In the ἡμῶν, "our^{un} righteousness", Paul includes himself together with all other men. The Apostle had previously pointed to the ultimate result of the history that comes to pass between God & man, to the facts of the case: God is truthful, but every man is a liar. In this contrast there lies first of all the fact that God's truthfulness proves the lying disposition of man. The details in vv. 1-4 follow first of all the tendency to establish how that preference of the Jews & God's faithfulness first really places into the light the unbelief of the Jews, the untruthfulness of the Jews, & the lying disposition of man. In the entire section from 1, 18 on the Apostle reminds the Jews & Gentiles of the greatness & severity of their sins & shows that they have no excuse & are punishable. That is the basis thought which is carried thru in the different turns of expression. But also turned around it appears that the unbelief & lying disposition of men prove & place in the light God's faithfulness & truthfulness, or, if we introduce the general concept, the injustice of man proves & places in the light the justice of God. When light & darkness stand close together, then the light makes the darkness appear so much the darker, but also turned around, the darkness makes the light appear so much the brighter. And this last thought, which also comes to expression in the Psalm passage

quoted, is now carried forward.

1) But if that is so, as is really the case, how unrighteousness comes the righteousness of God, "what shall we say?", what should we then say, what shall we conclude? "kott ist doch nicht ungerecht, dass er den Zorn verhängt" ("Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?"), $\delta \epsilon \pi \iota \phi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \eta \nu \sigma \rho \gamma \eta \nu$; The apostle speaks & reasons here after the manner of man, in the manner that the common human reason is accustomed to infer & conclude. The natural reason draws out of the above-mentioned premises the conclusion that God is unjust. It reasons & concludes: If the unrighteousness of man proves & places in the light the righteousness of God, then God is unjust, because he takes vengeance upon man, who sinned with his unrighteousness & contributes to the glory of his righteousness. "I could appear as unjust, if God would punish what reaches out to his glory & does so much in his interest." Weiss. The conclusion should really run: $\sigma \upsilon \nu \epsilon \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \varsigma \delta \epsilon \theta \epsilon \circ \varsigma$ etc.? How? Is God not unjust? But Paul intentionally introduces this question, like that of v. 3, with $\mu \eta$, "doch nicht." "To the apostle the sacrifice of such an assertion appears so forbidding that he himself in the deliberation anticipates the negative answer already beforehand." Weiss. And with the $\mu \eta$ $\gamma \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota \tau \alpha$, "Das sei ferne!", "God forbid!".

He then energetically rejects that question & conclusion in v. 5. The following statement: $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota \tau \omega \varsigma \kappa \rho \iota \nu \epsilon \tau \delta \epsilon \theta \epsilon \circ \varsigma \tau \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \omega \nu$; "Denn wie würde er" or "wie soll dann Gott die Welt richten?" ("For then how shall God judge the world?") is the basis of this rejection. The apostle points to the well-established fact of the future judgment of the world, which initially already absolutely excludes the thought, the possibility, that God could also deal unjustly. That God, the Judge of the world, is a just Judge applies to him according to the scriptures as an immutable axiom. "That he far from this to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked: & that the righteous should be as the wicked, that he far from this: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" ("Das sei ferne von dir, dass du das Thust und tödest den Gerechten mit dem Gottlosen, dass der Gerechte sei gleichwie der Gottlose. Das sei ferne von dir, dass du aller Welt Richter bist, du wirst so nicht richten.") Gen. 18, 25. The Judge of the whole world shall certainly not judge unjustly, still even in the following Paul places the instance of this counter-evidence further in the light. If God would be unjust, then it certainly would not happen - for certainly this is not his inability to do it is designated by the $\tau \omega \varsigma$ with the future - that he judges the world namely not this or that world in particular, but the world in general. We do not need to ask, why not?, since the apostle himself tells us that in the statement added on with $\gamma \alpha \rho$. "Hoffmann."

In v. 6 the apostle again takes up the fact already mentioned in v. 4 and repeats the protest of v. 5, only in another form: "Denn wenn die Wahrheit Gottes durch meine Lüge reichlich geworben ist zu seiner Verherrlichung," etc. ("For if the truth of God hath more abounded thru my lie unto his glory, etc.)

98,
3, 5-8.

He speaks here in the first person of the singular, as a member of humanity. And he sees the *ἐπερὶ ὧν* in that he transposes himself to the final end of man's destiny, & from there looks back into the past. The lying of men has become the occasion that the truthfulness of God has manifested itself so much the more richly, has even proven His faithfulness over against the faithless, & thus the lying of men has unfolded to the praise, to the glorification of God. And now he asks: If that is so, as it really is the case, *warum (vi) werde aber ich dann noch als Sünder gerichtet?* ("Why yet am I also judged as a sinner?") Calvin, Erasmus, Philippi take the entire sentence of v. 1. & 2, introduced with *γὰρ*, as a basis of that objection, i.e., from the standpoint of the natural reason, in that they put into parenthesis the words *ἡ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποκρίσις*. According to that the sense would be: If my lying has served to the glorification of God & His truthfulness, then there is no more reason that God should still judge & punish me for the sake of my sin, & if He still does this then He deals unjustly. God should still bear with it contentedly, that I increase His praise with my sins. And we should then intentionally do much more evil, so that good might come from it, so that God would be glorified. But it would be strange, if Paul, after he had rejected that false conclusion of v. 6 & had begun to state it, still subsequently established the same. And with this interpretation one overlooks the fact that with the *ὡς ἀπαρτῶ*, even the guilty character & the punishableness of sin is brought forth. No, with Hofmann, Meyer, Koelt, & others we take the statement in v. 1. & 2 in its connection with v. 6 as the basis of the rejection of that false conclusion, as a refutation of the same. The apostle next explains himself more closely concerning that fact, how far the judgment of the world, to which he had referred in v. 6, proves the divine justice. His meaning is this: If with my lying I have given God occasion to demonstrate His truthfulness so much more richly to His glory, which is then the foundation, how does it come that even I, who still glorifies God with my sin, shall still be judged as a sinner, that God still reckons my sin to me as sin, as guilt, & for that reason still draws me to judgment? That can only come from the fact that God is & remains the holy & just One. If He were not that, then He would not enter into judgment with me, but much rather would permit my sin, from which He has only benefit, to go unpunished. The *ὡς ἀπαρτῶ* gives the condition, in which he (man) becomes object of divine judgment, in order to call attention to the fact that to him shall be reckoned by God the lying which sets in light the truthfulness of God & which but too tends to the glorification of God. Why would this happen, if God were unjust? The unrighteous asks nothing regarding good or evil, but only after his own advantage. Thus God draws him to judgment as a sinner whose action tends to His glorification, thus He loves right & hates injustice. He cannot permit it that one should remain unpunished who has done what is evil. Hofmann.

The same purpose, as that of the first part, is served by the second part of the question, i.e., which

is also dependent upon the $\tau\iota$, "wherein," "why," i. e. it reads in whole: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\iota\ \mu\eta\ \kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma\ \beta\iota\alpha\varsigma\text{-}$
 $\phi\eta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\theta\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\delta\iota\ \tau\iota\ \nu\epsilon\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \nu, \dot{\epsilon}\tau\iota\ \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\iota\alpha\ \epsilon\dot{\iota}\delta\epsilon\gamma$
 $\tau\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}$. Many expositors think that his construction here runs irregularly, that his lipotele
 had wanted to write originally: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\iota\ \mu\eta\ \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon$, "why should we not do
 evil," etc., in that, however, he makes the subordinate clause introduced with $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$ into a
 parenthesis & has postponed the verbum finitum of the principal clause to the end, he has then
 made the latter dependent upon the $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \nu$ of the subordinate clause. However, it seems far
 more simple, with thought, to supply an $\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\tau\iota$ in back of $\mu\eta$; then the sentence runs entirely smooth &
 symmetrically, & we translate thus: "and wherein it is commanded, we are to do good works,
 and vice versa: *Et tunc agere, dass wir reden. Tunes tunc das: "Wie then, damit das gute heraus-*
komme?" (H. V.: "And not rather, (as we heard wrongly reported, & as some affirm that we say,) *Let*
us do evil, that good may come?") Paul here mentions an evil report, which was current regard-
 ing the Christians, with whom he joined himself, & it is still current today. This evil report was really
 a misinterpretation & perversion of the Christian doctrine of justification, especially of such
 statements as the expression of Paul, $\epsilon\iota\ \nu$: "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

also this final amplification of the Epistle contains an apology of the divine righteousness & a refutation of that false conclusion, that God is unjust, because He ordains wrath.

That God is just in His judgments falls together, as is shown by the sayings, with the other fact, that man stands as a sinner, as guilty before God and it is the latter at which the entire deduction of the Epistle basically aims. Neither the one fact, that God's faithfulness & truthfulness prove themselves also in the faithless ones & here, vi. 1-4, nor the other fact, which follows of itself out of the first, that the unrighteousness of man sets the righteousness of God in the light & glorifies it, vi. 5-8, the moral responsibility of man & the guilty character of sin, as it could somewhat appear, is not destroyed nor only lessened. The Epistle takes away every excuse from sinful man. In no respect is it a merit or work of man, it is not the natural result of sin, that it serves to the glorification of God, but it is the wonderful government of God, that God brings something good out of that which is evil in itself & which has in itself only evil, fatal results. It applies here what Olearius says in his "Critica Sacra" on the passage Rom. 3:1-8: *Turn deus sua sapientia in suam gloriam convertit scelera nostra hoc nullum est vitium nostrorum pro merito, sed totum divinae sapientiae ac providentiae opus, qui malis etiam rebus bene uti sciat, cum mala per se suaeque naturae nullam rem aliam nisi sibi similem parere possint.* The basic thought of the apostolic discourse in vi. 1-8 is this:

Man is & remains guilty & punishable before God, in spite of the fact that the being disposition of man does not destroy God's truthfulness & in spite of the fact that the sin of man results in the glorification of God.

3, 9-20. Scriptural Proof for the Common Guilt of Mankind.

vi. 9-18.

With a question similar to the one in v. 1, the Epistle in v. 9 introduces a new section: "What then?" How does the matter lie according to the sayings? "Haben wir etwas vor uns?" (Are we better than they?), namely we Jews, in whose name Paul here speaks, than the Gentiles? Thus we translate & take the *ὑποχρηστέμεθα* with Philippi Weiss, & most of the ancient expositors. This can be either passive, in the sense: "Werden wir übertragen (erue)?" Still the thought that the Jews would somewhat be expelled by the Gentiles lies entirely outside of the context. Or it is to be taken mediately. The middle *ὑποχρηστέμεθα* usually signifies: "etwas vor sich halten"; "etwas vorwenden" (pretend), "vorachützen" (pretend), & is always used transitively, therefore it must always have an object with it. As such the *τι οὖν* has been taken in our passage, as for example by Beza, & then *τι οὖν ὑποχρηστέμεθα*, taken as one sentence in the sense: "Was sollen oder können wir...

nummorum wender? But to this question the answer, ὅς τις τῶν , does not fit, which in this case must read $\text{ὅς τις τῶν Ἰσραηλίων}$. Or one imagines an object & covers the difficulty by paraphrasing: "Are we in a position to offer a defence?" "Does it stand with us, that something serves us as a defence, which places us securely before the avenging righteousness?" (Meyer) = "Do we still have a defence?" (Luthardt) No, since ἵπποδρομία is here used intransitively, therefore it does not permit itself to be understood otherwise than as the active ἵπποδρομῶν , otherwise used as intransitive, thus in the meaning: nummorum praestamus? nummorum antecellimus? Also otherwise in later profane Greek the middle form is often found instead of the active. *Minor*, *Para.* 25, 6 ff. *Vit.* 1, 5: $\text{ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ποδοδρόμοις}$ for $\text{ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ποδοδρόμοις}$. "Es ist eben an unserer Stelle die mediale Form nicht einmal wie *Vit.* 1, 5 ohne weitere Mitancierung der Bedeutung für die active gebraucht. Much rather one declares: Do we have some advantage for ourselves? Is an advantage beneficial to us? This explanation is too wide for the context, yes, in reference back to it completely unsuitable. *Philippi.* Similarly Weiss. With the energetic, ὅς τις τῶν = $\text{ὅς τις τῶν, ὅς τις τῶν}$, "durchaus nicht," "no, in no wise," the apostle answers this question in the negative. No, we Jews do not distinguish ourselves above the Gentiles; we are no better than the Gentiles. That objective prerogative of the Jews, *vi. 1 ff.*,

which continues to exist in spite of their unfaithfulness, does not carry in itself any subjective prerogative or advantage for the faithful. And confirms the answer: *cinis in hunc statum*: "Wenn wir haben zuvor Juden und Griechen beschuldigt, dass sie alle unter der Sünde sind" ("for we have before proved both Jews & Gentiles, that they are all under sin"). On this statement rests the emphasis. This statement contains the result of the entire previous presentation of portions of the Epistle from 1, 15 on, & this result the Epistle would show forth. The first person of the plural in ἵπποδρομία is the editorial "we." In the foregoing he had proved that the Gentiles, *vi. 1 ff.*, & also the Jews, *2, 1 ff.*, that the one like the other, that all men without exception, *3, 1 ff.*, are under sin.

"Unter der Sünde sein." $\text{ὑπὸ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ εἶναι}$, is not synonymous with "sündigen", "sündigen". The expression designates "not the conduct of men, but the condition in which they find themselves. Luthardt. But it is also not the meaning that the Jews & Gentiles are altogether enslaved under sin, are servants of sin; this point is not called into prominence in the foregoing, but Paul contents the common guilt of all mankind. All men have sin as a debt, have laid the guilt of sin upon themselves as a heavy, pressing burden; God imputes their sins to them, they are guilty, punishable before God. Certainly this

"schuldig sein", "unter der Sünde sein" presumes & includes in itself that whoever is under sin, whoever is guilty, is a sinner in himself & has sinned. Only the one who is actually a sinner & has committed sin shall be regarded by God as a sinner & held accountable for his sin. Even this the Epistle had presented previously, from 1, 15 on, once that Gentiles & Jews, that all men are sinners & have committed every conceivable sin, but then also, that their transgression contains in itself a severe guilt

that sinful men have no excuse, are fallen under the wrath of God, shall not escape the future judgment, & shall be judged by God as sinners.

But that Paul continues with $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\iota\alpha$, he introduces a scriptural proof. Everything that he himself speaks & writes is a certain truth; that he speaks & writes as an Apostle, as God's Word. Nevertheless he still supports his own authority by another authority & proves the accusation which he had raised against Jews & Gentiles with the testimony of the prophetic scriptures of the O. T. Thus the Christian doctrine of the complete & basic corruption & damnableness of the human race is corroborated by two reliable, infallible witnesses. At the same time the hypothesis, in that he arranges a short, pithy scripture passage, in *quibus magna est verborum atrocitas* (Melancthon), gives a short resumé of the foregoing detailed presentation of moral & physical depravity before man's eyes a portrait of himself at which he must reasonably be alarmed. The first scripture passage, $\nu\mu\omicron\varsigma-1\epsilon$, is the beginning of the 14. Psalm, which attests the universality of human corruption. The respective words, Ps. 14:1-3, read thus: "Er denkt der Thor bei sich: es ist kein Gott. Verderbt, abscheulich ist ihr Treiben, Niemand der tut es. Ich aber blickt vom Himmel nie der auf die Menschenkinder, zu sehen, ob Einsichtige vorhanden, ob Solche, die nach Gott fragen. Lämmtlich sind sie abgefallen, allzumal verderben, Niemand der tut es, auch nicht Einer." ("The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. They are corrupt, they have done abominable works, there is none that doeth good. The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, & seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one"). Out of this passage Paul takes only that which directly serves his purpose, omits what is said in the first verse concerning the frivolous deniers of God, in the second verse the looking around which God did on earth, & begins with the statement of 1c: "Da ist nicht der Gute thut" ("There is none that doeth good"), or, what is essentially the same: "Da ist nicht der gerecht sei," in that he here anticipates the conclusion of the third verse, "no, not one," in order to bring to light the principle thought, the universality of sin. He continues, corresponding to the sense of the Psalmist: "Der ist nicht der verständig sei" ("If there were any that did understand"), who would let himself be instructed of God; "Da ist nicht der Gott suchet," "nach Gott frage" ("seek God"), $\delta\ \epsilon\kappa\ \sigma\upsilon\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, no one who concerns himself about God. Here the Psalmist, & with him the hypothesis, traces the general moral corruption to its root, the inner alienation from God & enmity to God of man. And to conclude it reads: "Sie sind alle abgewichen, allzumal unnützig" or "nicht nützig geworden" ("they are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy"), $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\ \pi\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\ \nu\alpha\upsilon$. "Da ist nicht der Gute thut, auch nicht ein Einziger", really, "auch nicht bis auf Einen" ("there is none that doeth good, no, not one"), the one included, $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$. The following quotations bring to expression how human corruption demonstrates itself in speech, $\nu\upsilon.12.14$, and in the action & doings of men, $\nu\upsilon.15-17$. Both

of the first two statements of the 13. verse are reproductions of Ps. 51.0. Paul here also, as in the following, adopts the translation of the Septuagint: "Ein offenes bräust ihre Kehle" ("Their throat is an open sepulchre"). Their throat exhales death. "Mit ihrem Zungen heucheln sie" ("with their tongues they have used deceit"), according to the original text really: "ihre Zungen machen sie glatt" ("they polish their tongues"), they flatter the simple, in order to draw them more easily into their snares. The statement of 13b: "Bittergift ist unter ihren Lippen" ("the poison of asps is under their lips"), is taken from Ps. 140, 4. The poison of asps is a picture "of the cunning corruptible." 1. 14: "Ihr Mund ist voll Fluch und Bitterkeit" ("bitterness," "hatred"), "Whose mouth is full of cursing & bitterness". According to the Hebrew text, Ps. 124, the words run: "His mouth is full of cursing and deceit (טף דף) and fraud (ף נ). In the second passage the Septuagint retains the expression of the Septuagint, πικρία, which really has a further concept than the Hebrew טף דף, "Trug" (deceit), "Betrug" (fraud), the latter, however, includes with itself; he leaves the third word out since with the Σόφος of the Septuagint the Hebrew פן is actually falsely translated. Thus the different instruments of speech, throat, tongue, lips, mouth stand in the service of unrighteousness, to the corruption of the neighbors. 1. 15

Three statements in vv. 15-17 are shortened reproductions of Isa. 59, 7.8. "Sie Eilen und Eilen. (But zu vergiesen)" ("their feet are swift to shed blood"). They rush to the shedding of blood, such joy they have therein. Everything that man does to cause harm to his neighbor in body & life according to the Scriptures, according to the judgment of God is murder, manslaughter, shedding of blood. "Zermalmen", 6 v v t p i u u a, "und Eilen", 7 v d x i π u p i a, abstractum pro concreto, "ist auf ihren Wegen" ("Destruction & misery are in their ways"). On their way thru life they leave behind them destruction, those trampled under foot, & misery, misfortune, those whom they themselves trample under foot & have made unhappy. They pursue their advantage inconsiderately & trample under foot all who place themselves in the way of their interests from the right hand or the left. "und den Weg der Friedens kennen sie nicht" ("and the way of peace have they not known"), really: they have not learned to know, 0 v x E p v a d v. A way, upon which peace, salvation, & blessing would be spread abroad, has remained entirely strange to them, they have become accustomed only to do evil. With the final statement in v. 18, Ps. 36, 2b: "Es ist keine Furcht Gottes vor ihren Augen" ("There is no fear of God before their eyes"), the text again points back to the evil course, out of which all evil words & works of man flow. They have no fear of God, which could hinder them from doing evil. It is still to be considered that the cited Psalm passages, with the exception of Ps. 14, 1-3, speak of the godless in distinction from the righteous & that in Isa. 59, 7.8 the discussion is regarding the apostate Israel. But the godless are certainly the men of this world, among whom the universal human corruption has brought forth only its

104.
3, 19. 20.

full ripe fruits; & apostate Israel has become even as the Gentiles, the sinners of this world. "Always men are described as they are in themselves & have become by themselves." Hofmann and finally also the righteous have not entirely laid aside the universal human nature in this life. We recall further the fact that the Apostle in his portrayal of morals has before his eyes not the wild barbarian hordes, but above all the civilized world of his time. Likewise the highly praised culture and humanity of our day does not make man better & nobler than they are described here. It is indeed a dreadfully dark picture which the Apostle sketches here, but it is a faithful portrayal of man-kind. Thus the scriptures describe fallen man. Yea, of the man who had come forth from the creative hand of God with the image of God, there remains only such a caricature, such a grotesque picture of man.

3, 19. 20.

To this saying the Apostle still adds a remark concerning the Law & the people of the Law and reminds his readers of something that was already known to them. We understand under the Law, not the entire O.T. Scriptures, as that out of which the foregoing quotation is, for example, Deuteronomy, Meyer, & Weiss, but with Luther, Hofmann & others we take Rome, in its first meaning, in which it is found completely in the second chapter & evidently also in 3, 1, as the revealed Law, the Mosaic Law. Everything that the Law says & commands, it speaks to those who are under the Law, to the Jews, to the Law-people, really: to those who are held in the Law; among the Jews certainly the entire life in its separate & small that parts was regulated by the Law. However, the purpose of the Law & the instruction of the Law is, "dass jeder Mund verstopp't werde" ("that every mouth may be stopped"), that no mouth might be able to bring forth anything to its justification, "und alle Welt Gott gegenüber straf-fähig werde" ("and all the world may become guilty before God"), in other words. Thus the Law should only serve & help to that end, that that final end previously established by Paul might be reached. That the Gentiles, among whom the formerly named abominations come out most vividly & undisguised, are guilty and punishable before God because of these abominations, is understood of itself. But also the Jews, among whom these blasphemies & vices were hidden for the most part by a certain outward righteousness or by the appearance of devoutness, are no better & no better with God for that reason than the Gentiles. Even their Law, which they have in preference to the Gentiles, serves them to this end, & certainly according to God's intention, that they also must be silenced before God when God enters into judgment with them, that they also appear as worthy of punishment. How far this takes place is shown from the following. And so it comes out that every mouth shall be stopped, that all the world, Gentiles & Jews, stand there as worthy of punishment. That the Law has & should have the above presented result even

among those who are under the Law, is established in 11:20 by the fact that it does not & cannot have

the other effect, which men could somewhat expect, namely, that the Law assists no one to righteousness. "Denn our Gesetz werken wird kein Mensch vor ihm gerecht" ("Therefore by the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight"). The deeds of the Law are the works which the Law demands. The future δικαιωθήσεται, also here the logical future, we take as the future pertaining to the middle δικαιωσεται = "gerecht werden", to be justified, as also Luther, Hofmann, & others. Against the passive sense speaks the connection with ἐν νόμῳ ἡμῶν instead of with ἐν τοῦ νόμου. Thus now & never shall it come to the point that any man shall stand as justified before God as a result of the works of the Law. And why not? Because by the Law comes the knowledge of sin. The Law leads those who hear it & rightly place it before their eyes to the knowledge that they have not done the things demanded by the Law; that they are not even able to do them. And thus by the Law shall men be convinced of the transgressions of the Law, of their guilt & unworthiness of punishment.

In the section 11: 9-20 the Apostle accordingly draws out of the entire previous discussion the fact which he still also proves from the Scriptures, that all men, Gentiles & Jews, are guilty & punishable before God.

3, 21-31. Justification by Faith.

11: 21-26.

There begins here the second part & the principal part of the Letter, 3, 21-5, 21, which is introduced & prepared by the first part, 1: 8-3, 20. The real principle theme of the Letter is now amplified, which in one word is: "die Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt." Nevertheless also the first part, which established the common human corruption, serves this theme. For only he who has correctly understood sin grasps & understands also what righteousness is about, which is revealed in the Gospel. Only he who correctly feels & senses his mischiefs, his unworthiness & treasures also the rich good of the N. T., the grace of God in Christ.

The Apostle begins a new discussion, which had come to a certain pause, & addresses his readers as with a raised voice: Ἰσχυρὸς λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ, "Nun aber ist ohne Heuchel die Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt, offenbar!" ("But now the righteousness of God without the Law is manifested"). We take ἰσχυρὸς not in its temporal sense, as, for example, also Philippi does, but with Hitzig, Hofmann, Meyer, Weiss, & others in its logical significance, in which it is also often found otherwise, for example, Rom. 1: 16; 1 Cor. 5: 1; 12: 18; 13: 1 & 2. It introduces an actual contrast, as also the classical νόμος & εὐαγγέλιον, and designates as much as the Latin *a quo, nunc vero*. There is contrasted here not so much the Christian phase with the pre-Christian periods, but also not

only the revelation of the Gospel with the revelation of the Law, but much rather, particularly the Christianization of things with the status of things outside of Christianity. What follows from v. 23 on forms the contrast not only to that which had been said in the immediately preceding verses concerning the Law, but to the last entire section, vv. 9-22, & therewith to the entire description from 1, 18 on, which certainly had been gathered together in a summary in the section vv. 9-22. The Apostle had previously shown that all men, Gentiles & Jews, are under sin, that the whole world is guilty & punishable before God. And that is also even now, in the present time, the condition of things outside of Christ, outside of the Gospel. But he had previously spoken completely in the present tense. But now in Christ, in the Gospel a righteousness has appeared, which casts an entirely different light on the position of man to God, which gives a new appearance to the world.

But what kind of a righteousness is it, which the Apostle here raises & recommends to his readers? What does the expression *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* say, which we meet twice in this statement, vv. 21, 22, upon which all emphasis lies? That is the cardinal question, which we have already discussed shortly in chap. 1, 17, & upon which we must enter more closely. In no case can we think of an essential attribute of God, likewise not of a righteousness in the sense of truthfulness or goodness. Then, as already remarked earlier, when it speaks of the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, that it is revealed in the Gospel, or, as in our passage, that it has been revealed, it would say revealed & given to men, thus it appears as a gift of God to men. And as in the foregoing, v. 20, so it treats in the following, therefore, that, & how man is justified. It can only be asked, whether with this righteousness is meant "an ethical conduct of man" or "an ethical relationship of man to God." The Romanists understand under this the *justitia in fura*. Similarly Deixander, the Arminians & Socinians. In that way the Rationalists have given a new meaning to that which Paul says concerning the righteousness of God according to Wegscheider the kernel of the doctrine of righteousness is that man can enjoy the good pleasure of God not by simple outward, meritorious works, but only by true faith, that is, by a disposition ordered according to Christ's example & teaching & regulated in faithful fulfillment of his will to God, and indulge in the hope of a future, where virtue finds the prize of eternal salvation. The theologians of the Schleiermacher school lay all stress on the righteousness of life which follows from faith, for example, Althausen, Neander, Nitzsch, Dörner. Althausen remarks: "If God nothing can be acknowledged righteous or be declared thus, what is not (righteous)." And further: "The Law cannot bring it over to an outward legalism, however, through regeneration by grace an inner condition, the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, is created in the believer, which meets the highest demands." In the basis of our passage Paul speaks of a "Christian morality." Klostermann writes: "The *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, of which Paul speaks in vv. 21, 22, is exactly the same as in 1, 17: it is the new morality, with God manifest as the Creator, which has appeared in the world with the Christian life of faith, & which permits itself to be observed in man for

107.
3, 21-26.

an immediate result & effect of his faith in the Römische in a measure which always grows with faith in itself. The last readers of this tendency in the lutherische school, which have completely dissolved particularly the concept "justification" (Rechtfertigung), as well as the Christian's need to begin with the Römische & this Römische interpretation of the later German theologians & the American theologians. Fodge protests in the name of Protestantism & fights against it "as for the life of the Church." He appeals to the consciences of the Church & to the experience of all believing Christians. "A great deal may safely be made on this subject to the testimony of the Church or the experience of the people of God of every age & nation. They with one accord, at least in their prayers & praise, renounce all dependence on their own inward excellences, & cast themselves on the work or merit of Christ." "Nevertheless also the writings once among the recent German theologians, as Schubert, Meyer, Weiss, Hofmann, Luthardt, Klotz, Kahnis, Thomaßius, etc., energetically defend the old Protestant interpretation of Sim. 2.0 v. 7 & 2.0 v. 8 as the justitia imputata, even when they take 2.0 v. 8 as the genitive, autistic, & designate this righteousness as a righteousness originating from God, as established by God. Yet, whoever still has a spark of a Protestant conscience shrinks back from the thought that the righteousness & devoutness, which are found in us, should be that which we could in the critical moment put into competition with sin & guilt & with the wrath & judgment of God; he confers with Luther: "Therefore this is a greater man & a heavenly wisdom, that we believe; our righteousness, salvation, & comfort stand outside of us, that is, before God we are righteous, acceptable, holy, pure, & there is still in us real sin, unrighteousness, & foolishness. In my conscience there is the real feeling & thought of sin & the terror of death, & I should still look elsewhere & believe that no sin & death is there," etc. (Erl. Aug. 14, 15.)

The Lutheran Protestant doctrine of the justitia imputata, to which the experience of all the children of God gives testimony, has a firm, solid foundation in Scripture. The Scriptures have left no doubt remaining of what we have to understand under the righteousness concerning which Paul speaks here. In the foregoing section, this lower clause of the Pauline doctrine of justification, there are found together with Sim. 2.0 v. 7 & 2.0 v. 8 still other, similar expressions, which evidently should modify the first concept, which stands at the head of the section, the Sim. 2.0 v. 1 in 2.0 v. 1, & Sim. 2.0 v. 2 & Sim. 2.0 v. 3 in 2.0 v. 3. We would not ourselves more positively on what is meant with the Sim. 2.0 v. 7 & 2.0 v. 8 in 2.0 v. 2, then we must first of all ascertain what the Sim. 2.0 v. 1, said of God, and the Sim. 2.0 v. 2, said of man, mean.

The first question therefore is: What does Sim. 2.0 v. 1 mean, as dictated of God, & what does it mean in general? Kahnis remarks very decisively in his Dogmatik (I, 599): "Nach der cautionen Bedeutung des Hieher kann. 7. 1. 1. nach dem Character der Verba & auf's was kann Sim. 2.0 v. 1 nur Gerechtmachen bedeuten. Nichts ist aber oberflächlicher, als in dieser unbestreitbaren That-sache das Zugeständnis finden, dass die römische Uebersetzung von Sim. 2.0 v. 1, wornach es einen

moralisch gerecht machen heißt, die eigentlich grammatische sei, wie es Brotus, David Schultz, Thibaut gemeint haben. Es kommt darauf an, in welchem Sinne machen steht. Im Deutschen kann ε-μανδεν schlecht machen heissen: auf ihn so einwirken, dass er schlecht wird, aber auch in populärer Rede: ihn als schlecht darstellen. Es kann καὶ βᾶσις das reale Reinigen bedeuten, aber auch das declarative A. S. 10, 15. "Hofmann writes on 326: "For, indeed, the connection of Σικαιοῖν and Σικαιοῦν brings with it that Σικαιοῦν is regarded as an action, which makes it that the one whom it begets is righteous. But from that it does not follow that this being righteous (beredhtsein) is meant as the divine attribute in the sense of an inherent attribute." It can also very well, as Hofmann further explains, be a being righteous according to the judicial judgment of God, & thus Σικαιοῖν be meant as a "gerecht sprechen, a being declared righteous. We translate with Luther: "Gott ist es, der dich gerecht macht." This making righteous, however, can also be a declarative thing, can mean as much as "bewirken, to bring about, so that one is righteous, Σικαιοῖν, according to God's judgment & opinion, & can also signify "für gerecht erklären" (to declare righteous), "für gerecht halten, anerkennen" (hold or regard as righteous). Thus εἰς ὁσιότητα signifies essentially "würdig machen" (make worthy), never something else, as "würdigen" (estimate, rate), "für würdig achten" (to regard as worthy). And which is now the actual meaning of Σικαιοῖν, whether this verb designates actually an ethical change or a declaration of righteousness, justitiam infundere or justitiam imputare, or something of both, in one passage this, in another passage that, only the use of language can determine.

What concerns the use of language of profane Greek, Bremer, in his "Wörterbuch der Testamentlichen Sprach", has gathered together all passages out of the extra-biblical Greek literature, in which this word is found. He gives the result of his inquiry in these words: "In profane Greek it means to establish as Σικαιοῖν and certainly in a forensic manner through judgment, never aliquem justum reddere, but aliquid justum censere, "für recht erachten" (to consider as just), "für recht erkennen" (to acknowledge as just). "The most usual meaning of Σικαιοῖν is: to consider just or reasonable, & then it is always combined with a real object, often with an object clause, mostly with an infinitive clause. It is usually found in such combinations as: νεκροῦς βάλειν Σικαιοῖν. (Euripides) "Ich achte es für gut, die Todten zu begraben." But it also often has a personal object with it & then it means as much as: "verurtheilen" (condemn), "strafen" (punish), very seldom the opposite: "rechtfertigen" (justify). It is thus completely, without exception, a verbum forense and never designates a making righteous in the sense of moral change. In later Greek church language it is used also for the designation of council decisions; for example, Can. 17, conc. Nic.: εἰ Σικαιοῦντες ὡς ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη, οὐ νόμος.

With this agrees the idiom of the C. P. Greek. Also here with this expression there is designated a judgment, a decision, never a capacity for righteous treatment. In the Septuagint Σικαιοῖν is the usual translation of פ. ת. ל. ש. That signifies altogether "recht sprechen" (speak justly), "rechtfertigen".

ἄνθρωποι, "wie sollen wir uns rechtfertigen?" ("How shall we bear ourselves?"). In the Psalm passage already treated above, Ps. 51, 4, it is said of God, "auf dass du gerechtfertigt werdest," $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$, synonymous with "gerecht seiest," "als gerecht erscheinst," $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{N.} \text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$, "wenn du redest" ("that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest"). But now these forensic expressions, $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$, and the corresponding P.T.Y. , $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$, are also referred to the intercourse which man has with God, to God's judgment & sentence over man. Thus, for example, Exod. 23, 7: "Den Unschuldigen und Gerechten sollst du nicht erwürgen; denn ich laesse den Gottlosen nicht Recht haben" ("the innocent & righteous slay thou not: for I will not justify the wicked"). $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{N.} \text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$. The Septuagint here introduces in a like manner these words, persons: $\text{ou Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$. According to 1 Kings 2, 32 Solomon prays to the Lord that He might hear in heaven & judge His servants - $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$ $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.} \text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.} \text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$, "den Gottlosen zu verdammen und den Gerechten freizusprechen" ("condemning the wicked... & justifying the righteous"). The dictum of Paulin 3, 20: $\text{Διότι ἐξ ἑργων νόμου οὐ Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha \text{ πᾶσα ὁμάς ἐν ὧ πῶς αὐτοῦ}$ alludes to Ps. 143, 2: "Und gehe nicht in Gericht mit deinem Knecht" ("enter not into judgment with thy servant"), $\text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.} \text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$. $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$ $\text{N.} \text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$. The passive $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ is here, as also elsewhere, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$, the middle passive, corresponding to $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$. No living person is, appears as justified before God. Similarly Job 9, 21: $\text{ἵνα ὅτι ἔτι ζῶν ὡς ἵνα ὅτι ἔτι ζῶν}$, $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$, $\text{πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὅτι ἔτι ζῶν}$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$. Luther: "daß ein Mensch nicht rechtfertig bestehen mag gegen Gott" (7. 1: "How then can man be justified with God?"). Job. 25, 4. In other passages the $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ is expressly modified by $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ ἀναφανέσθαι . Exod. 23, 7, as the Lord says to Job: $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$ $\text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$ $\text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ ἀναφανέσθαι . "What dost thou condemn me, so that thou mayest be righteous?" ("Will thou condemn me, that thou mayest be righteous?"). Altho Job knew that no man is righteous before God, still he is certain of the final judgment of justification of God, 13, 8: "Siehe, ich habe den Rechtsstreit zugewandt; ich weiss, daß ich werde gerecht sein" ("Behold now, I have ordered my cause; I know that I shall be justified"), shall appear & stand as justified before God. $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$ $\text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ ἀναφανέσθαι . In Isa. 53, 8, the suffering Messiah speaks: $\text{ἵνα ὅτι ἔτι ζῶν ὡς ἵνα ὅτι ἔτι ζῶν}$, $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$ $\text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ ἀναφανέσθαι . "Er ist nahe, der mich rechtfertigt; wer will mit mir hadern?" ("He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me?"). In the Messianic prophecies the discussion is frequently regarding the M. act of grace of justification. Thus, above all, Isa. 53, 11: $\text{ἵνα ὅτι ἔτι ζῶν ὡς ἵνα ὅτι ἔτι ζῶν}$, $\text{P.T.Y.} \text{J.}$ $\text{J.Y.} \text{Q.} \text{P.}$, $\text{Sika} \omega \theta \eta \nu \alpha$ ἀναφανέσθαι . The last phrase of the sentence serves as an explanation: "und" (Luther correctly: "denn") "er trägt ihre Sünden" ("for he shall bear their iniquities"). The meaning can only be this: The servant of the Lord shall justify many, release them from their sins, in that He bears, takes upon Himself

their sins. Of the N.T. people of God it says in Isa. 45:25: $\text{פָּדָה יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל מִכָּל חַטֹּאתָיו}$ ("On the Lord shall all the iniquity of Israel be justified"). The Septuagint translates: $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ δικαιοθῶσιν , "sie werden von Gott her gerecht sein", "that their being justified shall be imputed, awarded to them on the part of God. Suitable to פָּדָה , פָּדָה , δικαιοθῶσιν , δικαιοθῶσιν we must now & then, where the context brings it out, understand the substantive פָּדָה , פָּדָה , δικαιοθῶσιν of the justitia imputativa. Thus in the well-known prophecy: "und dies wird sein Name sein, da er man ihm werden wird: Herr, der unsere Gerechtigkeit ist" ("And this is his name whereby he shall be called: The Lord, our righteousness"), יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ . Further in Isa. 45:24: those who turn to God shall say: "und Herr ist mir Gerechtigkeit. יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ , δικαιοθῶσιν , und Stärke" ("in the Lord have I righteousness & strength"). According to Isa. 54:3 righteousness, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ , δικαιοθῶσιν , and peace appear as the blessings which flow out from the living Messiah upon His people.

The use of language of the apocrypha coincides completely with the Septuagint, as the examples above which Bremer was cited.

And now also in the N.T. we encounter the same terminology. What first of all concerns the non-Pauline writings, there δικαιοθῶσιν , δικαιοθῶσιν never have a different meaning than that of "rechtfertigen" to justify. In Luke 18:29 it says of that scribe: $\text{ὁ δὲ θελων δικαιοθῶσιν ἑαυτου}$, etc. "Er aber, indem er sich selbst rechtfertigen wollte", etc. ("But he, willing to justify himself", etc.). Similarly Luke 16:15. In Luke 7:29 were said: $\text{οἱ τελεωναι εἰς δικαιοθῶσιν του θεου}$, etc. "Die Zöllner rechtfertigen Gott", "indem sie sich taufen lassen" ("The publicans justified God, being baptized", etc.). Similarly Matt. 11:19; Luke 7:35. To the judgment of God the expression refers in Matt. 12:37: $\text{ἐκ των λογων σου δικαιοθῶσιν καὶ εκ των λογων σου καταδικαιοθῶσιν}$. "Aus deinem Worten wirst du gerechtfertigt", "freigesprochen" (absolve, acquit), "und aus deinem Worten wirst du verurtheilt werden" ("By thy words shalt thou be justified, & by thy words thou shalt be condemned"). Even so in Luke 18:14, where it is said of the repentant publican, that he went down justified, εἰς δικαιοθῶσιν , to his house. To the Jews in Antioch of Pisidia Paul testified according to Acts 13:38: $\text{ἐπεὶ παντων ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἔντεν νομος. Μωυσεως δικαιοθῶσιν, ἐν τούτῳ πως ο. πιστευσαι δικαιοθῶσιν}$. That means: "Durch diesen, nämlich Christ, wird jeder, der da glaubt, gerechtfertigt", "this is, absolved", "non Altem", "all sins", "wovon ihr durch das Gesetz Moisis nicht gerechtfertigt", "this is, not absolved", "werden konntet" ("Thou this man is reached unto you the forgiveness of sins: & by him all that believe are justified from all things, from whence ye could not be justified by the law of Moses").

Especially, however, in δικαιοθῶσιν a terminus technicus of the Pauline letters, particularly

113.
3, 21-26.

für sich hat" (Hofmann, Luthardt), *conditio dei probata* (Grimm), 'die gerechnete & recht-
igkeit' (Schieritz). Complete agreement reigns here among the ancient & modern Exe-
getes. That we do & why we take the genitive θεοῦ with Luther & the ancient theologians, with
Fritzsche & Philippi, grammatically as *genitive objecti* and accordingly translate: 'die
Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt' ('the righteousness which avails before God'), has been
mentioned with the necessary reasons already above in 1, 17. That otherwise James in his Letter
presumes the Pauline doctrine of justification & adopts the Pauline terminology, thus using
δικαιοσύνη in the same sense as Paul & other Greek authors, does not need to be discussed further
in this place.

Therefore this δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, which Paul praises in 3, 2, which overrules the sin,
guilt, & anger as truly not our own righteousness, not something good in us, but a righteousness
which rests outside of us in God, in God's judgment, & which is therefore as firm & unshakable
as God Himself. What God says, judges, or decrees, that avails, that has now & validity in time &
eternity. Whom God declares righteous is righteous, even if the whole world & all the devils con-
demn him, even if his own conscience finds fault with him & condemns him. And of this right-

eousness it is now said that it is manifested, *πεφανερωται*, namely, in & with the
preaching of the Gospel. The perfect shows that this is a fulfilled fact, but which continues still,
as far as the Gospel, which at that time had entered into the world, is continually preached. In
1, 17 it states that the righteousness which avails before God is manifested, *ανεκαλυφθη*, & *νο-
ηθη* in the Gospel; here it states that it has been made manifest, *πεφανερωται*. The
verb *παρεγοσιν*, to set into the light, is different from *ανεκαλυφθη* & *νοηθη*, manifest, 1, 17, with
regard to the picture, not the meaning. The latter is used of an object which had been covered by
a veil, & which one makes perceptible, in that one takes away the veil; the former is used of an object,
which is placed in the shadows & upon which one permits a stream of light to fall. "Hoc est. The
being revealed does not stand in contrast to a previous being hidden in God's decree. For this
contrast is not indicated here by anything, while it is expressly marked, for example, in 1 Pet. 1, 20.
The *πεφανερωται* presupposes that even that which was then manifested was already present
beforehand, even though in a hidden manner. Only that which exists is manifested. The righteous-
ness of God existed, when & before it would be set into the light, "und zwar in Wirklichkeit,"

"nicht nur die Möglichkeit nach, die dann erst hinterher durch das Verkünden des
Evangeliums zur Wirklichkeit erhoben würde." The judgment of God, which declares the sinner
righteous, came & was settled long ago, & is now made manifest & known to sinners through the
Gospel. Jesus Christ, whose name is mentioned in the following verse, has revealed, established
the N. L. righteousness, & this prepared gift is then offered & presented to men in the preaching of

the Gospel. The decree of salvation of God, εἰς εἰ, includes, according to the statement of the Lord in Luke 24, 46, 47, two things: one, that Christ must suffer & rise again from the dead, whereby the forgiveness of sins is merited & prepared, & then that in the name of Jesus, repentance & forgiveness of sins be preached among all nations, so that the available forgiveness might be made known & imparted to all nations thru this preaching. And in our passage also this is the meaning of Paul; for the righteousness of which he speaks is identical with the forgiveness of sins. ἡπίς νόμος, ὁμοῦ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐστέ (with us the Law) this righteousness also shall be manifested. The Law interrupts nothing in the Gospel. Here in the preaching of the Gospel God demands nothing of man, absolutely nothing, but promises only, gives & presents, namely, the N. T. blessing of righteousness. This preaching is for the sinful, a quite a new doctrine, new tidings & wisdom, which never had come into the mind & heart of a single man. Nevertheless it had in some measure been known by the O. T. people of God. It is the ancient truth. The righteousness, of which the Epistle speaks & writes, was already testified by the Law & the Prophets, that is, by the scriptures of the O. T. Luke 24, 27; Acts 28, 33. The Epistle here points not only to such passages of the O. T., which speak nominatively of that righteousness, as Gen. 15, 6; Hab. 2, 4, as the above-quoted statements of the prophets, but principally to the prophecies of the Old Covenant, which speak of Christ & the salvation in Christ. The salvation in Christ, however, is essentially nothing else than the righteousness which avails before God. Very correctly the expositors here point to the well-known dictum of Augustine: *Novum testamentum in veteri latet, veteri in novo patet.*

The principle concept of the sentence is again taken up in the following verse, v. 22, in order to add a modifier: ΣΙΚΑΙΟΘΥΝ ΣΕ ΘΕΟΥ ΣΙΑ ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Εἰς Πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ Πάντας τοὺς Πιστεύοντες, "und zwar (Sē) die Berechtigung vor Gott durch den Glauben an Jesus Christum, für Alle und auf Alle, die da glauben" ("even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all & upon all them that believe"). The concept "Glaube", faith, is here brought into prominence. The righteousness of which the Epistle speaks is righteousness of faith. The sense of this statement remains unchanged, when, according to the example of some ancient manuscripts one omits καὶ ἐπὶ Πάντας. We retain the questionable words, "da wohl," as Meyer judges, "das doppelte πάντας die Abschreiber voranisset hat, sie ausgelassen." As in 1, 17 that righteousness is designated as ΣΙΚΑΙΟΘΥΝ ΘΕΟΥ Εἰς ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ Εἰς ΠΙΟΤΗΤΑ, so it is here designated thus first of all as ΣΙΚΑΙΟΘΥΝ ΘΕΟΥ ΣΙΑ ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. When Lange, Beneke, & some others take Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as genitive subject and speak of the truthfulness of the faith of Christ as the means of our justification, then that is an absurdity which needs no refutation. ΠΙΟΤΗΤΑ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is apparently identical with the immediately following ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ Εἰς, as well as with ΠΙΟΤΗΤΑ plainly in 1, 17; 2, 25. 27. 28. 29. 30. In Gal. 2, 16 the expressions ΠΙΟΤΗΤΑ

ἡ ἁγία ἡ πίστις ἡ δικαιοσύνη are modified by αἱ ἐμπέτες εἰς ἡγιασμένον ἡ ἁγία ἡ πίστις ἡ δικαιοσύνη. Gal. 2, 20; 3, 22; Mark 11, 22; Eph. 3, 12. None of faith in Jesus Christ is meant and ἡ ἁγία ἡ πίστις ἡ δικαιοσύνη is to be taken as genitive object. But now what is the relationship, shown by the εἰς, of faith to the righteousness that is manifested in the Gospel? Modern expositors satisfy themselves for the most part by simply remarking that this righteousness is mediated thru faith, & say no word of the fact as to how far the latter mediates the former. According to their former remarks faith appears as the effective cause of the divine judgment of righteousness. But that directly contradicts what Paul had expressed even in v. 21 concerning the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. According to the presentation of the Gospel the righteousness which avails before God had been on hand before it was revealed, before preaching of faith. The preaching of the Gospel, which reveals & presents this righteousness, first renders possible & awakens faith. Thus the meaning can only be this, that the righteousness before God is imparted to us thru faith, is made our own thru faith. The εἰς does not show the means of the restoration, of the acquisition, but the means of the appropriation & assimilation. Thus Körner remarks on our passage: *Adjungitur explicatio per definitionem et exegimus quae et quid sit illa justitia, et quomodo haec nobis contingat et applicatur. Tunc est medium, quod haec justitia nobis applicatur.* And Hodge: "This righteousness is thru faith, as it is received & appropriated by faith." In justification faith is solely, as the ancients call it, medium apprehendens, medium apprehensivum. To that also corresponds the concept "Glaube," faith. Πίστις, πίστις εἰς is confidence, reliance. And, as Bremer correctly defines it: "das T. Πίστις εἰς, sich auf die T. siliegenwart bezieht, auf eine nicht erst erhoffte und erwartete, sondern geschehene und vorhandene T. als Bethätigung Gottes, so ist der Glaube nicht ein sich hingelassen, sondern ein hinnehmendes Vertrauen, oder vertrauensvolle Annahme der Heilgnade." The first object of πίστις in our passage is ἡ ἁγία ἡ πίστις ἡ δικαιοσύνη. Faith confidently takes, grasps, & apprehends Jesus Christ, but even the Christ of whom the Gospel speaks & in whom the righteousness is found which avails before God. On that man embraces the Gospel, he thereby appropriates to himself Christ & even thereby the righteousness, which Christ has prepared & which is manifested, presented to him in the Gospel. Thru faith the individual draws upon his own person the judgment of righteousness of God which has already been settled, so that now this judgment, this righteousness which avails before God is his own, personal possession. And even this is God's purpose, even this also belongs in the ordinance of salvation, that man

applies to himself the perfected righteousness which God has created for sinners thru Christ & rejoices & comforts himself in that from the heart. The δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is, therefore, as the second modifier states, on hand, completed, determined for (εἰς) all who believe, similarly εἰς πίστιν, "für den 'Glaubenden'," from faith to faith, 4, 13; and as it comes, put over itself out as a stream upon all who believe. The emphasis lies upon the double πίστις. Only he who always believes, be he who he may only

He who takes what God presents, shall share thereby in this great blessing of the M. V.

[illegible]

There follows now in v. 24-26 a long statement on the manner & method of becoming righteous. On this statement, on the modifiers of *Sikaioi vasa*, lies all the emphasis. I belong to Pauline use of language that he often adds principle thoughts, important phases of the development to a previous statement, which is not stressed in like manner, in a participial clause or a relative clause. Luther: "They are all sinners, etc. is the chief part & the center of this Epistle & the entire Scriptures." "They have all sinned & come short of the glory of God, in that they have gratuitously become righteous by the power of His grace thru the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," etc. It is first of all brought into prominence that

we have become righteous. Suppose, "gechekkerie," "imposed" (gratuitously), we have in no way

merited or earned it. The concept Suppose is strengthened by the second modifier, τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, by virtue of or by the power of His grace. The grace of God, χάρις, in the strictest sense, in distinction from love, goodness, etc., is God's favor & grace over against sinners. "God's mercy & grace are given impartially to the undeserving, as in Rom. 3, 24 Paul says: We are pardoned & justified freely & out of pure grace." Luther. Erl. Aug. 27, 98. The emphasized position of the αὐτοῦ makes it possible that we owe our righteousness to God alone, exclusively to the free grace of God, in no respect to ourselves or to our own action. The grace of God, the disposition of God, is the motivation for our justification. The third modifier names the means of the justification: διὰ τῆς ἀποθνήσκουσας τῆς ἑξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. This latter statement is not coordinated with, but subordinated to, the foregoing. According to the gracious disposition God has sent Jesus Christ as Redeemer of the world & has set Him as a covering of expiation (Lühndel), in order in this manner, by these means, to justify sinners.

It had been remarked in v. 22 that the righteousness which has been before God is imparted to us through faith in Jesus Christ. What Jesus Christ has to do with our becoming righteous is now unfolded further in v. 24b, 25. Jesus Christ has come & has redeemed sinners. From what? That is supplied from

The context & from the entire first part of the letter. Here the battle had shown that all men, Jews & Gentiles, are sinners & are under sin, that they are guilty & worthy of punishment before God, & have nothing else to expect than the wrath of God. Thus from sin, guilt, & punishment has Christ redeemed us, and absolutely ransomed. The verb ἀπολυτοῦν, and the substantives ἀπολύσις, derived from it, are often found in the general meaning "to free," "free, liberate," "to free," "liberation, deliverance." Thus in the passages which treat of the final redemption, which will come on the last day, when God shall deliver His own, from all evil, for example, Luke 21, 28; Rom. 8, 23; Eph. 1, 14; 4, 30. But where the redemption from sin, guilt, & punishment is described, which Christ has merited through His suffering and death, there ἀπολυτοῦν & ἀπολύσις is always used in its own, original meaning, in the sense of "to ransom," "ransom," "to ransom." Christ has redeemed us from all sins & from the wrath of God, in that He deposited a price, a ransom, λύτρον. Christ Himself testifies that He has come εἰς τοῦτο ἵνα λύτρον αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων, Matt. 20, 28; Mark 10, 45, and Paul says of Christ ὁ ὁ Θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίμιστον ὑπὲρ πάντων, 1 Tim. 2, 6, and ὁ ὁ Θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων, ἵνα λύτρον ᾖ ἡμῶν ἀπὸ πάντων ἀνομιών, Tit. 2, 14. That for ἀπολύσις in our passage the strict mean-

ing of purchase, requiring through the payment of a purchase price, is to be retained, is shown also by the synonymous expressions ἀγοράζειν, 1 Cor. 6, 20; 7, 23; ἑξαγοράζειν, Gal. 3, 13; and πείπειται, Acts 20, 28. The manner of speech is taken from the common human relationships. Men were accustomed to ransom prisoners of war or slaves through the presentation of a ransom (Lösegeld) from imprisonment or slavery. Thus with the payment of a high price Christ has ransomed sinful

manhood out of guiltiness. And what is this price, this ransom payment? It is, according to the above cited Scripture passages, He Himself, His own life, or, what is the same thing, His own blood. We have in Christ redemption through His blood, $\tau\eta\iota\ \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\sigma\iota\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, Eph. 1, 7; Col. 1, 14. St. Peter writes: "Ye know that ye were not redeemed, 'erlöset,' $\epsilon\delta\omicron\tau\omega\sigma\iota\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$, with corruptible things, as silver & gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ." 1 Pet. 1, 18, 19. Likewise in our passage, in the immediately following relative clause, the blood of Christ is mentioned. Because of their sin-writes, which Paul had counted out in the first section of his Letter, men are worthy of death, $\epsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, 1, 32; they have forfeited life with their sins. Now Christ has come & put His life in their place, has shed His blood, for them, & thus sinful men are released from sin, death & damnation. Christ Jesus is, as Paul has brought into prominence in the introduction of his Letter, the Son of God, & is thereby, as Paul confesses in Rom. 9, 5, God over all. And the life, the blood of the Son of God, yes, God's blood, God's martyrdom, God's death. That is indeed the payment & ransom price for the whole world. That Paul gives evidence regarding the redemption, that it is present in Christ Jesus, $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\ \delta\iota\omega\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\ \iota\gamma\kappa\omicron\upsilon$, not only that it has taken place through Christ Jesus, points to the remaining fruit, the continuing power & effect of the redemption of Christ, which is certainly itself a solitary, final act.

The redemptive work of Christ is described according to the other side in the following relative clause, v. 26, which modifies the previous statement. It reads: $\delta\iota\ \pi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\epsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\iota\omicron\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\gamma\ \tau\omega\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, "welken hett vorgebetelt hat als Sühnelehen durch den Glaubenn in seinem Blut." "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood." The expression $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\sigma\iota$ is taken from the civil legal relationships, the other $\iota\delta\alpha\epsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ from the Israelite ritual of sacrifices. The first & foremost question is: What does $\iota\delta\alpha\epsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ mean? None of this ending designate a concrete thing, which has some relative definition of the action of the verb from which it is formed, as $\chi\alpha\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$, a gift of thanksgiving, or $\nu\iota\kappa\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$, a prize of victory. Accordingly $\iota\delta\alpha\epsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is something which is serviceable & appointed to $\iota\delta\alpha\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$, to expiation. To expiate, "sühnen," $\iota\delta\alpha\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$, in biblical language, when it designates an action relative to the relationship of God & man, to speak with Hofmann, means: "to bring it about that the sin of man ceases, für Gott breche der Zorn gegen ihn zu sein." And some expositors take the substantive $\iota\delta\alpha\epsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in the general sense of "Sühnmittel," means of expiation, others in the special sense of "Sühnopfer," offering of expiation. Both interpretations agree with all grammatical fundamentals. One cannot prove that the Greeks had really used the word in one of these two meanings. What concerns the latter interpretation, thus one finds the remark in recent commentaries: $\iota\delta\alpha\epsilon\tau\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ signifies in profane Greek usually "Sühnopfer," offering of expiation. On the other hand, according to all the passages referred to, Brenner has

stated, "that the assertion, $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ is in classical Greek a customary expression for offering of expiation is decidedly false." Only one single passage can one adduce with an assurance of right for this designation, namely, 4 Macc. 17, 22. But there the discussion is only regarding a "Zühndenode," an expiating death. $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon$, thus the adjective $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ is used. In extra-scriptural Greek the substantive $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ signifies nothing else than "Zühngeld," gift of expiation, & this meaning evidently does not fit in our passage; Christ can still not be designated as a gift of expiation, as also no one has maintained. In order to recognize what meaning Paul has tied up with the word in question, we must, above all, become acquainted with the biblical idiom. And there it then stands firm, is also denied by no one, that in the Septuagint $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ is the usual translation of the Hebrew זָהָרֶה , that is, the "Zühdeckel," which is the golden covering over the ark (Luther: "Gnadensuhl," mercy seat). Thus, for example, Exod. 25, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; 31, 7; 35, 2; 37, 5, 9; Lev. 2, 16, 2, 13, 14, 15; Num. 7, 89. Twice there is found together with $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ the apposition $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$. Exod. 25, 17; 37, 6. And now applies what I have written: "The foundation forms the exegetical axiom, that, when in the N. T. expressions of a religious nature are used, which have already received a permanent meaning in the Septuagint, then it is woe to a hundred to one, that it is to be used in the already fixed sense." In our case the matter stands thus, that in Greek literature in general only two meanings can be proven for the noun $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$: that of "gift of expiation," in profane Greek, which is absolutely excluded in our passage, & that of "Zühdeckel," covering of expiation, in the Septuagint. And so we are grammatically forced to take $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ in Rom. 3, 25 in the sense of "covering of expiation"; at the same time in the second passage in which the word is found in the N. T., Heb. 9, 5, the meaning "Zühdeckel," "covering of expiation," comes to the eye. In view of this certified linguistic result, which is adopted by most of the church fathers, by the old Lutherans as well as the Reformed theologians, & acknowledged among the recent ones, for example, von Hofmann, Philippi, Hilgenfeldt, Ebrard, & Bremer, the actual objections against the comparison of Christ with the C. H. mercy seat, which are hardly worth the discussion, need no special refutation.

Since we now correctly understand the designation of Christ as the covering of expiation, we must likewise take into consideration the modifier $\text{ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ θείου}$. Christ is a covering of expiation in His blood or by the power of, by virtue of His blood. It is therefore combined with $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ as well as $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$ with $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$. For if one first of all draws $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ to $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$ and has the Epistle say that God had put Christ forth by means of faith as a covering of expiation, then that is to speak with no manner of contradiction. If, on the other hand, one joins $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$ to $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$, then one must also, of course, because of the grammatical parallelism, take $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$ as modifier to $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$.

120.
3, 21-26.

Otherwise it has no real sense when one says that God has presented Christ as a covering of expiation by the power of His blood. For *נָסַח* means "present, put forward", and not "aufstellen", set up, erect, as Philippi & others translate it.

Christ appears as the antitype of the O.T. mercurial. So it is necessary that we picture to ourselves the meaning of the latter. Its expiating power & effect lies in the blood with which it was sprinkled every year, and since this blood was the blood of a sacrificial animal, we must first of all go back to the meaning of the O.T. sacrifice. When an Israelite had sinned against one of the Commandments of God, then according to the regulations of the Law he took an animal of his flock, & certainly an animal in which there was no spot nor blemish, & brought it to the Tabernacle, later to the Temple, & certainly into the precinct of the sanctuary. There he laid his hand on the head of the animal & thereby substituted the same for his own person, & so in a symbolical manner transferred to it his sin, his guilt. That the laying on of hands had to mean this, that thereby the animal was not only in general consecrated to the Lord, appears from Lev. 16, 21, where it is prescribed that the high priest should lay both hands upon the head of the one sacrificial goat, & confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, & putting them upon the head of the goat. "Thereupon the priests killed the sacrificial animal. With his sin the man had forfeited his life, merited death. Now in his place the innocent life of the animal had been given over into death, the blood of the animal had been shed. The animal, to which the sin of the man had been imputed, tasted the punishment of the sinner. Now first the officiating priest entered into the sacrificial action. He took the blood of the animal & touched the same on the horns of the altar of burnt offerings or poured it on the sides of the altar or poured it out on the base of the altar, & thereby brought it near to God. For the altar was the place where God would come together with His people. Exod. 29, 42. The blood of the sacrificial animal atoned between the sinful man & the holy God & thus atoned for the sin of the man. Throughout the Law there is ascribed to the blood of the sacrifice the power & efficacy to expiate sin. The Hebrew expression for "Lahme" expiation, is *לָחַם*. The verb, *לָחַם*, really "decken", to cover, is found only in the Piel & certainly always in the figurative sense of covering of sin, of guilt. This *לָחַם*, "sühnen", to expiate, is usually construed with *עָל* as the verb of covering & joined mostly with a personal object, Lev. 4, 26. 31. 35; 5, 6, etc., on the other hand, however, also with an actual object, for example, Lev. 7, 35; 5, 17. Nevertheless according to the matter in hand, it is entirely the same, whether one presents this "covering", that the sin is covered, or that the man, the soul of the man, even with regard to the sin, is covered. The 32. Psalm declares the man blessed, "whose sin is covered," *יְיָ עָלָה* *לָחַם*, really: "who is covered with regard to his sin." The blood of the sacrifice applied to the altar of God covered the sin or covered the sinful man before God, before God's eyes, so that God no

longer saw, no more regarded his sin, no longer accounted himself sin. But for that very reason the blood was for the expiation of his sin, because in & with the blood his life, the soul (Seele) of the animal flowed away & thus had atoned for the punishment of his sin. In Leviticus 17:11: "Die Seele des Fleisches (die das Fleisch belebende Seele), ist im Blut und ich habe es euch gegeben auf dem Altar, zu süßnen eure Seelen; denn das Blut, es süßnet vermöge der Seele." "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, & I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." That finally the flesh of the sacrificial animal as a part of the same was kindled & burned upon the altar "for a sweet savor to God," symbolized & attested that God was now no longer angry at the sinful man, but looked upon him with eyes of love & grace. He evidently the blood of oxen, goats & lambs did not have itself the power to expiate the sin, but only insofar as it was laid as a seal to the better sacrifice of the New Testament. The basic idea of the sacrifice, therefore, was the satisfaction vicaria. In opposition to Bähr, Hofmann, Dehler, & others, who have published hypotheticals of the O. Testament, but have dissipated the idea of the sacrifice, the old, churchly doctrine has recently been upheld by Kuntz, Tholuck, Delitzsch, & Philippi, & has been proven in conformity with Scripture.

The significance of the sacrifice is the basis for the correct understanding of the sprinkling of the blood, which the high priest caused to be placed upon the golden cover of the Ark of the Covenant, on the great day of atonement. The treatment of the sacrifice of the annual day of atonement, which culminated in this sprinkling of blood, was, to speak with Keil, "the highest & most perfect act of expiation of the O. T." "On this day all the sins of Israel during the entire past year were expiated." (Keil). "Jahrbuch der Biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments" I, p. 445 ff. "On that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your iniquities in the Lord." Lev. 16, 30. On this day the high priest should "make an atonement for the priests, & for all the people of the congregation." 1. 33. The essential features of this great act of atonement are the following: "The high priest, clothed in white linen on the day, took a young bullock as a sin offering for himself & the priests, & two he-goats as a sin offering for the people & placed them before the Lord before the door of the Tabernacle, later the Temple. Hereupon he killed the bullock, the sin offering for himself & the priests, then filled the censer with coals from the altar of burnt offering & both his hands with holy incense, carried both into the Holy of Holies & there by laying the incense on the golden coats caused a cloud of smoke to arise by which the covering of the Ark of the Covenant, the table of the presence of God was covered, so that he could casually draw near to it. Now whilst the Holy of Holies was filled with the smoke of the incense, the high priest went back to the forecourt, took the blood of the bullock, then entered the Holy of Holies for a second time, & with his finger sprinkled the blood's first upon the front side of the covering of the Ark of the Covenant, then seven times upon the ground in front of the Ark of the Covenant. Thereby he atoned for his own & the priests' sins; certainly the sprinkling of

122.
3, 21-26.

on the Ark of the Covenant served for the atonement of the person of the high priest & of the priests, the sprinkling on the ground before the Ark of the Covenant for the atonement & cleansing of the Holy of Holies, als welches wie das übrige Heiligtum dadurch, dass es sich während des vergangen Jahres nicht minder inmitten einer sündigen Priesterschaft als inmitten einer sündigen Gemeinde befand, auch durch die Sünden der Priesterschaft verunreinigt worden war. After the expiation of the priesthood had been completed, the high priest left the sanctuary the second time, went back to the forecourt, there slew the goat which had been designated by lot as the sin offering of the congregation, entered into the Holy of Holies for the third time with its blood, & sprinkled the blood in the same manner as he had sprinkled the blood of the bullock. The meaning of the twofold sprinkling of the blood of the goat is analogous with the twofold sprinkling of the blood of the bullock: it would first of all atone for the sin which rested on the congregation & then the sin which had passed over from the sin of the congregation to the sanctuary which was found in their midst. Kehler. In a similar manner by means of the blood the Holy Place & the forecourt, especially the altar of burnt offerings, were expiated, purified of all the uncleanness of the children of Israel. And so the service, which the congregation performed in & on the sanctuary thru the priesthood, hereafter appeared again as a clean, unblemished, God-pleasing worship.

The characteristic in the offering of the great day of atonement was thus the conclusion that the blood of expiation was brought into the Holy of Holies & was sprinkled on the cover of the Ark of the Covenant. The instruments of the Holy of Holies formed the throne of God of Israel. The Ark of the Covenant, which carried in itself the two tablets of the Covenant, was the foundation, the golden plate over the chest at the footstool of the throne. On this cover stood two golden cherubim, whose wings were spread out over the same, whose countenances were turned toward the same. These cherubim appear as images of the heavenly cherubim, as the "Throne-organ" of God. Between the cherubim, over their outspread wings hung the "cloud", that is, "the cloud of the divine glory, in which Jehovah manifested His presence in the Holy of Holies over the Ark of the Covenant." Keil. 5. Exod. 40, 34. Further in Exod. 25, 22: "There I will meet with thee (Moses), & I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Lev. 16, 2: "I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat" (Hap-poreth). Thus in that the high priest on the day of atonement applied the blood of the sacrifice on the mercy seat, he brought it into the immediate presence of God, held it, as it were, directly under the eyes of God, & thus the blood of expiation had real & true value before God. The tablets of the Law in the Ark admonished Israel of their sins & transgressions & accused them before God. Now, however, in the midst, between the table of the Law in the Ark & the holy God, who was enthroned above the cherubim, there was the blood sprinkled mercy seat, upon which the countenances of the

cherubim were turned upon whom the countenance of God was turned. The blood sprinkled on the mercy seat (cover) covered over the tables of the Law, covered over Israel's transgressions of the Law before the eyes of God, so that God no longer saw, no longer regarded them. When God thinks about His Law & His people's transgressions of the Law, then He must be angry with them. The mercy seat with the blood, however, changed the wrath of God into grace & pleasure. Thus in the sacrifice of the great day of atonement the thoughts of expiation & atonement found their strongest & most concrete expression in the golden mercy seat branded with the blood of expiation.

In order to estimate fully the act of expiation of the great day of atonement, one must still take into consideration what happened to the second sacrificial goat of the congregation. Keethier, after he had described the threefold entry of the high priest into the Holy of Holies, & the sprinkling of the blood of the first goat, says the following on this subject: "For with the real action of expiation was ended. What happened further had the purpose of symbolizing thru an outward act how Jehovah would now regard all the sins committed during the past year & their unclean acts that occurred as completely put away, so that hereafter they should in no way appear as burdened with them & blamed by them. At the end the high priest laid both of his hands on the head of the second goat, which

had not been killed, as a sign that he applied something to it with all energy or laid something upon it. What this now was appears from that which the high priest did to it further: over it he confessed all the guilt & transgression of Israel according to the multiplicity of their failures & thereby laid them on its head. Covered with these the goat was led by an attendant out into the wilderness, into a secluded region, whereby he took them far away from the congregation & could never again bring them back anymore; the congregation went free of them completely & forever. Now since the congregation had already actually been freed of their sins by the goat slain as an offering of expiation, especially by the sprinkling of the blood of this goat, then really by means of it the action must have been completed thru which Jehovah declared the congregation as having become free from their sins; for the atonement of the sins of the congregation & the release of the congregation from their sins are not two different events, but one and the same thing, only regarded from different sides or under different points of view. But since it was physically impossible to use the slain goat for presentation also of the fact that the congregation, thru the expiation of their sins, had been completely freed of them, therefore another goat had to step into the place of the slain goat, in order to symbolize thru that which happened to it & without there being a release of the congregation from their sins, which came as a result of the expiation. Accordingly the two goats together formed only one single means of expiation of sin or sin offering."

And now in our passage thru the three years of the 3^d mercy seat, at the same time, however, as the counterpart of the 3^d sacrifice. For it is certainly significant by the

124.
3, 21-26.

power of His own blood, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. All the types of the Israelite sanctuary & worship prophesy of Him, Christ. Christ is in one person as much as sacrifice, priest, & mercy seat. Christ Jesus has stepped into the place of sinful man & has taken upon Himself the guilt of the whole world, which was guilty before God, Rom. 3, 19. Men have not enlisted this substitute for themselves; they go along in their sins, have pleasure in their sins, Rom. 1, 32, & do not even desire a Redeemer, a sacrifice for their sins. No, according to His own free grace, unasked & unpetitioned, God has ordained & given His Son to Mankind as Mediator & Expiator. The expression οὐκ ἠσθε βέβαιον ἡμῶν ἵνα ὑπολάβω includes everything in itself, that God has designated & made Christ an ἵνα ὑπολάβω. The Lord placed all our sins upon Him, has imputed all our sins to Him; Isa. 53, 6. God has made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, 1 Cor. 5, 21. And Christ Himself, freely, has taken all our sins upon Himself, imputed them to Himself; Isa. 53, 7; 1 Pet. 2, 24. And thus He has offered Himself for us. He is at once the same time sacrifice & priest. In place of sinful men, who were worthy of death, Rom. 1, 32, He has given His own life into death, has shed His own blood. With this blood of His, with His holy, precious blood He has appeared before God Himself. He is our Mediator before the highest throne, He has made His blood available before God, & thus, not for the time being, but once has atoned for our sins, the guilt of the whole world, & turned God's wrath into pleasure. Marked & sprinkled with His own blood, He stands as the real M.M. mercy seat in the middle between sinful men, the transgressors of the Law, & the great & holy God, & conceals all our sin, guilt, shame, & nakedness before the eyes of God, so that God no longer sees them, no longer regards them, no longer reckons them to our account. & eventually, corresponding to the O.T. type, the men on their part are completely, thoroughly, & eternally freed of their sins, freed, released, & unnumbered of all their transgressions & uncleanliness. That is what the expression, ἵνα ὑπολάβω ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, contains in itself.

What the Epistle attests in Rom. 3, 24, 25 as clearly & intelligibly as possible is, to speak with Ebrard, "the co-offense understood & based biblical, Pauline, Petrine (1 Pet. 1, 18; 2, 24), & Johannine (John 1, 29, 36; Rom. 5, 9 ff.) doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ." But now he designates the vicarious satisfaction of Christ as the means of our justification. We are justified "durch die Erlösung" ("thru the redemption"), etc., διὰ τοῦ ἐρωσίου. διὰ τῆς ἐν ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, etc. Christ's redemption is a means of justification, first of all, in as far as it is the cause, meritorious of the same. We are justified in this way, that God, when He justifies the sinner, regards the holy, precious blood of His Son Jesus Christ, thru which the guilt of the entire world has been expiated, thru which sinful men are redeemed from sin, guilt, wrath, & condemnation, that God declares the sinner righteous for the sake of the bloody merit of Christ. Justificatio a meritis propter Christum, propter meritum Christi. The justifying judgment of God, to speak with the ancients, is no cogitatio inanis, no empty figmentum, but has a solidum et perfectum fundamentum, a fundamentum in re, and this foundation is even Christ's blood, Christ's expiation & redemption. The comfort of the justification consists not in this, that "the man lies in the delusion that sin shall be dis-

persecuted without anything further, God does not make an allowance for it, the grace of God understands that of itself. Edward. Such delusion does not stand the test in temptation. The conscience of the sinner comes to rest only then, when it can say to itself, that the guilt really has been paid & atoned for, the punishment really has been expiated & carried away. That we are justified thru Christ's atonement & redemption says still more, says also this, that even thereby the righteousness which avails before God is actually effected & established. Christ's death & blood, His atonement & redemption are also the causa efficiens justificationis. We do not have to present the matter to ourselves as if, after Christ had merited & earned the grace of justification with His suffering & death, God first really justified man, afterwards, when he had fulfilled some certain conditions. No justification is the immediate effect of the bloody sacrifice of Christ. That Christ placed His life, His blood, as a ransom for sinners, that He has offered Himself & has appeared before God with His blood, has the immediate result & effect that God now no longer regards the sins of men, no longer accounts their sins to them, (but), rather looks upon them with eyes of pleasure. The discounting of sin: *Nicht-Zurechnung*), however, according to the facts is identical with justification. Whom God no longer regards as a sinner, him God looks upon as justified. Thru Christ's death & blood the sinners are redeemed, released from

guiltiness; they are freed of sin, completely & eternally, freed from sin, guilt, & punishment, & certainly freed with regard to God, according to God's judgment & opinion. And what else is that than justification? Thru Paul uses "*Verechnung*" and "*Rechtfertigung*" as identical concepts, when he writes in Rom. 5, 9: *SIKAIW JESTES VOU EI TU AJMATI ATOU* and then makes in verse 10 for that: *KAT' HAY TPOU TU BEW. DIA TOU BAPTISOU TON VIOU ATOU*. Luth. remarks very aptly in his "*Socii*" in the article *De justificatione* (p. 24. 315): *Christus mediator et salvator est non tantum merito, sed et efficaciter. Neque enim meruit, ut per nos vel per alios ea, quae ad justificationem nostram pertinent, effluerentur, sed ea effecit et adhuc efficit, in quibus justificationem nostram et salutem nostram consistit, qualia sunt liberatio a peccato, diabolo, morte, et ira Dei et applicatio horum beneficiorum. Et ideo merito vocatur causa efficiens.* And further: *Christus non meruit, ut aliquis alius re justus coram Deo ad vitam aeternam, sed obedientiam seu satisfactio Christi est illud ipsum, quod nobis imputatur ad justitiam, seu quod est nostra justitia coram Deo ad vitam aeternam.*

Like as in this mode of *SIKAIW JESTES VOU*, which describes the manner & way of our becoming justified, there is the thought of faith. Christ is called *DI' APOSTOLOU DIA TIS HOTIS*.

Here there can exist no doubt that faith comes into consideration only as a medium apprehendens. For the atonement of our sins is completed thereby, that Christ shed His blood; it is not just effected & occasioned by the subsequent faith. It is a perfect atonement which Christ has accomplished, which needs no supplement on the part of man, which only needs to be apprehended by faith. The mode of expression *DI' APOSTOLOU DIA TIS HOTIS* serves as a confirmation to the above-mentioned

ented conception of $\Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \Sigma\iota\delta\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \tau\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Thus it is faith which applies to itself, which claims for itself the atonement & redemption of Christ, the atoning power & effect of the blood of Christ & the righteousness established thereby, which avails before God. The distressed sinner takes his refuge in faith in Christ, the merciful, & there finds protection & covering against God's wrath & judgment. The first object of faith is the Word. And to that the expression $\tau\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ points. God has presented, freely, openly, placed before the eyes of the whole sinful world, His Son Jesus Christ, whom He had made to be sin & the atonement of sin for us, & then revealed Him as such, as a covering of expiation, as a mercy seat, thru the preaching of the Gospel, which goes out into all lands. On the Gospel, the crucified Christ is portrayed before the eyes of men. Gal. 3, 1. The sinner hears the Gospel of Christ, of Christ's death, blood, & wounds, & in that they believe the Gospel, accept this same, they accept Christ & become partakers of the benefit of Christ, the atonement & redemption of Christ & even thereby the righteousness of Christ, which avails before God, & thus in this manner they become devout & righteous before God.

To the relative clause $\delta\iota\ \tau\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\sigma\iota\upsilon$ etc. the Apostle still adds a statement of purpose: $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota\upsilon\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, "zur Erweisung seiner Gerechtigkeit" ("to declare his righteousness"). V. 25 God has presented His Son Christ as a covering of expiation, whose atonement one should receive only in faith, who is this by virtue of His own blood, with the purpose of proving His own righteousness by this means. From the addition of this declaration of purpose the position of $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\tau\iota$ is explained, which one should otherwise expect immediately after $\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\sigma\iota\upsilon$ and before $\Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. For even thereby, that God has devised a violent death for His Son, that Christ has shed His blood & even that His blood had atoned for the sins of mankind, God would manifest His righteousness, & thereby that He presented Christ in His blood & wounds before the eyes of men, prove & demonstrate His righteousness before the whole world. With the expression $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in this connection, however, it is impossible to mean that $\Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ concerning which the discussion was in 3, 21. i 2; 1, 17, cannot possibly be meant the righteousness which avails before God, the righteousness merited & presented by Christ for mankind, but since it is spoken here not of an offering or revelation, but only of a proof of the righteousness, $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota\upsilon$, demonstrative declaration *quae factis fit*, (to imm), only of a characteristic attribute of God. That is proven also by the parallel expression $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, "auf dass er selbst gerecht sei", ("that he might be just"). V. 26. Therefore with old theologians, such as Quenstedt & Calov, & most of the modern expositors, we understand under $\Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in our passage the recompensing righteousness of God, as the Apostle had described it, for example, in Rom. 2, 13ff., according to which God recompenses everyone according to his works, which establishes itself over against sinners, transgressors of the Law as a righteousness of judgment. Edward Engelke pertinently: " $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota\upsilon\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \Sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\gamma\epsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$,

etc. For $\Sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is here as always: $\Sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ which comes forth out of an attribute & thereby gives news of its presence. Consequently $\Sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ can here designate only the divine attribute & cannot be understood of our righteousness before God, as then also the genuine of the pronoun $\Sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ appears only in the positive sense ("his") & not as a genuine of reference. ... $\Sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is therefore in the righteousness as an attribute or an exact essence of God, ... and designates nothing less than the divine righteousness, & certainly above all the punishing righteousness, whereby God in His decisions & dealings conducts Himself according to His holiness, thus decrees His $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\eta$ over sinners. For that the preparation of an atonement is the opposite of a judgment of righteousness (Weier), is quite an assertion."

And certainly therefore, in & with the death of Christ, God would erase His righteousness, His judgment of righteousness, because until that time He had overlooked the sins of mankind, "wegen der Übersehung der ganzen Geschichte der Menschheit" ("for the omission of sins that are past, thru the forbearance of God"). God had previously, in the time before Christ, overlooked the sins of the Jews & Gentiles, had let them pass by, go unpunished. $\text{H}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ $\text{protermissio peccatorum}$ is not the same as $\text{H}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ $\text{remissio peccatorum}$. By virtue of the patience of God in the times before Christ the sins of men had remained unpunished. The patience of God, $\text{H}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ $\text{to}\varsigma$ $\text{H}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, is something else than the grace of God, $\text{H}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\text{to}\varsigma$ $\text{H}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$. The patience of God postpones the punishment, while grace suppresses it completely. "The wrath of God which nevertheless in the times before Christ has broken out often over Jews & Gentiles, was no adequate recompense which atoned for the sin." Meyer, Weier. "4000 years the spectacle presented by mankind, as it were, was a continual offense for the whole moral world. Apart from several great examples of judgments of punishment the divine righteousness appeared to be asleep; one could even ask whether it was existent. Man sinned on earth & lived notwithstanding. Man sinned again & prospered in security even to old age. ... This comparative impunity of sin had made a solemn declaration of righteousness necessary." God's. & also death, which is the wages of sin, ruled from Adam even to Christ, still it was a "comparative impunity," & even a proof of the patience of God, that sinful men, before they died, lived years & decades, securely & gayly in their sins on earth. For whoever sins is not worthy to live one day longer. While the sins of mankind had thus remained unpunished so long, the righteousness of God, however, demanded punishment of sin, therefore in Christ in & with the death of Christ, God has finally solemnly manifested His righteousness. And He had previously overlooked the sins in Christ's sake!

"Die Erweisung seiner Gerechtigkeits in der Welt" ("to declare, & say, at this time his righteousness"). v. 26. Already in the time before Christ, when He permitted the sins to go unpunished, He had had this righteousness of His in His eye & in prospect in the future times. Because of the second mention of the proof of the divine righteousness is introduced with $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$, not as the first, with $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, and because here in the declaration of purpose itself the designated divine proof of righteousness in the

128.
3, 21-26.

present time is brought into prominence, it appears to us most proper to connect the modifier $\pi\acute{\rho}\sigma$, $\tau\eta\upsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\iota\nu$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\upsilon\upsilon\eta\varsigma$, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\nu\tau\iota$ $\pi\alpha\rho\omega$ with $\pi\alpha\rho\omega$, according to the examples of Hofmann, Luthardt, & others, instead of taking it as a resumption of the purpose clause $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\iota\nu$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\upsilon\upsilon\eta\varsigma$, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$. He Weiss correctly remarks, according to the facts of the matter it certainly comes to the same point, whether one refers the words in one way or another.

What the Apostle says here of the proof of the divine righteousness is still an integral part of the Pauline biblical doctrine of the satisfactio vicaria. With this bloody sacrifice Christ has satisfied the righteousness of God, & certainly the righteousness of wrath. The divine righteousness demands punishment. And now in Christ all the sins committed in the time before Christ, yes, the sins of all men, of all generations even to the end of the world, have been punished. The punishment of sins is death, death in the full sense of the word, death & damnation. And now Christ has died the death of the sinner. He has died a violent death, has poured out his blood on the tree of the cross amidst the most horrible torments & tortures. In this death the wrath of God worked & ruled; Christ has stood in the judgment of the sinner. Thus He has given perfect satisfaction to the divine righteousness. "The Church sings: 'Wie heftig waren Sünden den frommen Gott entzündet, wie Rache und Eifersucht, wie grausame Rache, wie zornig seine Huthen, welche aus dem Himmel schrien.' Previously the Apostle had shown that through Christ's death & blood the sin of men has been expiated, the sinners have been redeemed. That agrees very well with the assertion that in Christ's death & shedding of blood the righteousness, the righteousness of the wrath of God has proved itself. Even thereby, that in Christ the sin of the world has been punished, the sin has been atoned for, so that God no longer imputes them to man. It is a misconception when modern theologians set punishment & expiation one against another & say, the one excludes the other, God's righteousness demands either punishment or atonement. God's righteousness demands simply punishment of sin, nothing further. And punishment of sin in genera is certainly not identical with atonement for sin. If the sinners would be punished because of their sins, if men must die & be condemned because of their sins, then with such suffering of punishment they never atone for their sins, with the punishment of hell they likewise cannot pay the last farthing of their guilt, but remain there all eternity under sin, guilt, & punishment, under God's wrath & judgment. For with their sin they have brought upon themselves an unending guilt. But the punishment of the sinners, which lay upon Christ, is certainly an atonement for sin. Christ, the eternal Son of God, with his innocent, bitter suffering & death has taken away the punishment for sin, has exhausted divine wrath & judgment.) Thus the wrath of God, which was kindled against sinful mankind has subsided, so that man is now free, unburdened, unburdened by sin, guilt, punishment, by wrath & judgment.

In v. 24 the Apostle had named the grace of God as the motive of justification & thereby also the redemption of Christ, by which the sinners are justified. Here in vv. 25, 26 he mentions the divine right-

concerns as that which manifested itself in the suffering & death of Christ. Nor, however, it is a

base perversion, when one traces redemption, atonement, & justification back in part to grace, in part to righteousness as the motive in God, & presents redemption as an agreement, as it were, a compromise between the grace & righteousness of God. No, what has moved God to redeem, justify, & save sinners is exclusively His grace, His free grace, as Belshazzar once expresses himself, "the unfathomable & boundless grace of God," which has its foundation only in itself. In v. 63 Paul names the grace of God solely as the cause, impulsor of our justification & redemption, 1st 1st 17, and in vv. 25, 26 says only this of the righteousness of God, that it had proven itself in the bloody death of Christ. It is foolish human speculation, when one deduces the redemption of sinners out of the essence & attributes of God & thus also out of His righteousness. The redemption of sinners was in no respect an act of necessity, neither a parte hominum nor a parte Dei. If God had condemned the sinful race of man without anything further & had never thought of a redemption & salvation, then He would have remained that which He was & is, the great, holy, righteous God, the good, upright, perfect God, certainly He would likewise not have thereby denied His love. God had given men, His creatures, to experience His love in the fullest measure, & man had despised His love, had not

glorified their benevolent Creator, as God nor had they thanked Him, & were therefore guilty of death. It was a very special, as it were, unheard-of, unbelievable, entirely free impulse of divine love, an impulse of love, which we call grace, which moved God to redeem the lost & condemned race of man, to save the irretrievably lost world nevertheless. But certainly now, since He has planned & carried out the work of redemption & salvation of sinners, God has not denied His righteousness, has not laid it aside. That He could not do otherwise He would have denied Himself. He had much more thereby given room in fullest measure to His righteousness & righteous wrath, which had been kindled against the sinners. That Christ, the substitute of many, who took upon Himself the sins of man kind, had to give His life & blood, was proof of the divine righteousness. Where there is sin, there is also punishment, even when the sin is laid upon Christ. Righteousness demands that. On the other hand, that Christ has essentially entered into the place of man & has taken upon Himself all the sin & guilt, & there will also all the punishment of man, the death & judgment of the sinner, that God has placed all our sin & its torments upon Him, in order to redeem, justify, & save man, was entirely an issue & an act of divine grace. The natural outcome of the divine

proof of righteousness on against sinful mankind would have been this, that the sinner himself would have had to suffer & undergo the deserved punishment. But now the grace of God has stepped in between, has taken righteousness into its service, & given the course of the same a different turn, so that in its entire weight it has fallen upon the holy, long of God, & so in the man no longer needs to fear the divine righteousness, & can comfort himself in life & death, that God is gracious

130.
3, 21-26.

to him, that even the holy, righteous God no longer has anything against him.

After this discussion, which was necessary to place the concepts "grace", "atonement" & "righteousness" in the light & in the correct relationship to one another, we turn once again to the statement in vv. 25-26, whose conclusion we have still not taken into consideration. God has presented Christ as the covering of expiation, who is this by virtue of His blood, as a proof of His righteousness... & for this final purpose, "dass er selbst gerecht sei und gerecht mache den, der da ist des Glaubens an Jesum" ("that he might be just, & the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus"), εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δίκαιον εἶναι τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. God wanted to be both & to prove Himself as both, the Just, therefore He has punished sin, punished it in Christ & the One who justifies, justifies others, the sinners, therefore He has atoned for the sins of mankind, has redeemed the sinners thru the death & the blood of Christ, thru the complete execution of punishment on Christ. Therefore men should also give Him the honor as the One who is & remains just, & still at the same time justifies the sinner. Thus the Epistle returns to the principle thought of the section, the justification of the sinner. And He also here once again mentions faith, which applies the atonement & redemption of Christ & the justification effected thereby, in that to δίκαιον εἶναι he adds τὸ εἶναι πιστῶς Ἰησοῦ, "den, der des Glaubens an Jesum ist" ("him that believeth in Jesus"), really, him who has his nature from faith in Christ, to whom faith is characteristic. The believers, who appropriate in faith Jesus & the righteousness merited & presented by Jesus, which awaits before God, are really the justified, whom God regards as justified. Whoever does not believe, rejects Jesus & His judgment of justification which is pronounced by God in Christ over all sinners, places himself outside of this judgment & is & remains ὑπὸ δίκῃ τῷ Θεῷ, remains under the wrath of God, to which men have fallen because of their sins.

In the above expounded section, Rom. 3, 21-26, this locus classicus of justification, as already in the similarly short passage, Rom. 4, 13-17. St. Paul shows with clear, plain words the course of God's concerning our salvation & the way to salvation. They are plain, simple, yet very significant words, full of the powers of God, full of spirit & life, thus offered that sinful man might be born anew. Two examples of the effect of these words might still find place here. The one is the example of Luther. Luther writes (Séjz. Aug. XIII, Anh. 150 ff.): "I had (1519) in truth a hearty desire & inclination to really understand St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, & nothing had previously hindered me in that, except the single little word justification Dei (righteousness of God, in the first chapter, v. 17, where Paul says that the righteousness of God is revealed in the Gospel. To this word, 'the righteousness of God,' I was very hostile, and according to use & custom of all teachers I had been instructed & taught nothing else than that I must understand it in a philosophical manner of such righteousness, in which God is righteous of Himself, does & works right, & punishes all sinners & unrighteous, which righteousness one calls the

131,
3, 21-26.

essential ('wesentliche', formations) or real ('wirkliche', actings, righteousness. Now it stood with me thus: 'I live like a holy & blameless monk, & still found myself a great sinner before God & with that of an anxious & restless conscience, I dared not assure God with my satisfaction & merits. Because of that I did not love this righteous & wrathful God, who punished sinners, but I hated Him and (thus this has been & is to be considered no blasphemy) secretly & with righteous earnest I was angry at God, & often said: Is God not then satisfied in this, that He covers us poor, wretched sinners & already condemned by original sin to eternal death with all sorts of torments & torture of this life together with the terrors & oppression of the Law, that He must still increase this torment & sorrow of heart thru the Gospel's by the same preaching & voice threaten & proclaim His righteousness & earnest anger even further? Here I often became furious in my perverted conscience; but still with many reflections I clung to the beloved Paul, what he still said in the same place, & had a heartfelt thirst & desire to know the same. With such thoughts I spent day & night, until by God's grace I noticed how the words clung to one another, namely, thus: 'The righteousness of God is manifest in the Gospel as it stands written: The just shall live by faith. From this I have learned to understand the righteousness of God, in which the just lives by faith alone out of God's grace & goodness, & noticed that the meaning of the Gospel was this, the righteousness which avails before God had been revealed thru the Gospel, in which God justifies us by grace & genuine mercy thru faith, which one calls in Latin: justitiam passivam, as it stands written: The just shall live by his faith. Here I felt immediately that I had been born anew & now at the same time had found a wide open door, had even gone into Paradise itself; now also the beloved Holy Scriptures appeared to me very much different from what it had previously; for that reason I soon ran thru the whole Bible, as I would remember it, & also in other words according to this rule gathered all its statements, as, that this is called God's work, which God Himself works in us; God's power, whereby He makes us powerful & strong; God's wisdom, whereby He makes us wise; thus also the others, God's strength, God's salvation, God's glory, & the like. Now as I had previously hated this word of God's righteousness with all earnest, so also on the other hand I began to dearly & highly consider this as my most beloved & comforting word, & the same place in St. Paul had in truth become to me the real gate of Paradise."

Another proof of the impression which the foregoing words of Paul can make is the example of the noted English author Cowper, which I had related. It was a time when Cowper had almost completely fallen into despair. For a long time he had paced back & forth in his room in passionate agitation. Finally he sat down at the window, & when he discovered a Bible there, he opened it, in order to try, whether he might find comfort & strength there. "The passage to which I turned," he says, "was Rom. 3, 25. When I read it, I immediately received the power to believe. The entire fulness of the rays of the Sun of Righteousness fell upon me; I saw the complete satisfaction of the atonement accom-

132.
3, 27-31.

glorified by Christ for my pardon & my complete justification. In one moment I believed & received the peace of the Gospel. "If the arm of the Almighty had not held me," he adds, "I believed would have been choked by thankfulness & joy; my eyes filled with tears; emotion robbed me of my voice. I could do nothing except look up to heaven in quiet contemplation, full of love & amazement. It is better to describe the work of the Holy Spirit with His own words: It was the joy unspeakable & full of glory. 1 Pet. 1, 12. "Now, although such joyful excitement & emotion does not continue & gives place again to other moods, the words of Paul concerning the full satisfaction of Christ, of the righteousness which avails before God, can still give to the soul a peace which is higher than all understanding & which overcomes all temptations & even the terrors of death.

3, 27-31.

From the previous presentation the Epistle now, in v. 27, draws an inference: τοῦ οὐκ ἔστι καὶ ὑψηλῶς; "Wo ist nun das Ruhmen?" ("Where is boasting then?") Philippi: ὅτι καὶ ὑψηλῶς gloratio, not τοῦ καὶ ὑψηλῶς, 4, 2, gloria di materia. The boasting itself, not only the foundation of the object of the boasting, has disappeared. To be sure, only that because this ("Allerdings nur gegen, weil dissecr"). Paul thinks not only of the gloriation of the Jews, as he had pictured it in Rom. 2, 17ff., but speaks here, as the ὁρῶντες in v. 25 prove, of men in general. All men have by nature a proud heart, have in themselves the instinct to boast of themselves, to boast of their own accomplishments. All such boasting "ist ausgeschlossen" ("is excluded"); ἐξ ὧν δὲ ἵσθαι δεῖ καὶ καὶ ὑψηλῶς, gloratio, non admissa, remota est. Theodoret: οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ παρ' ἐξουσίας. Und with what, by what means? "Durch welches Recht? Durch das Recht der Werke? Nein, durch das Recht der Glaubens" ("By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith"). The expression νόμος is found here in its general meaning, "Regel", "Ordnung", regula, quod constitutum est (Luther), as also the Latin lex and the German "Gesetz" are often used in this wider sense. Certainly the law of works, νόμος τῶν ἐργῶν, is identical with the law in its narrower, usual meaning, with the law as demanded by the law; this ordinance of God, tells man what he should do & have undone, it demands works. And by the law, to be sure, the gloriation of man is not entirely excluded. For if that should according to God's determination also lead man to a knowledge of sin, to the knowledge that he had not done the works demanded by God, & thereby all the world is made guilty before God, ὁπίσθι, then it still gives to the fleshly-minded man an occasion "for boasting with work righteousness" (Mayer). On the other hand, through the other ordinance of God, concerning which the Epistle had previously spoken, through the law of faith, all boasting, all occasion for self-praise is entirely cut off. Νόμος τῆς ἐξουσίας, in the ordinance of salvation, which is displayed in the Gospel, & it therefore includes faith in itself. The Gospel speaks

to man of faith, not in the sense, as if it demands faith as the Law demands works not as if it
 that this one work, faith, would be demanded in contrast to the many works of the Law,
 but in the sense that according to this regulation man needs only to believe, only to accept that which
 God proclaims, promises, gives, & imparts. "Hier tritt recht klar hervor, wie der Glaube nicht etwa
 nur qualitativ eine andere Leistung ist als die früher geforderten $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, sondern qualitativ etwas
 völlig anderes als jede menschliche Leistung, das Vergleichen auf fallen eigenethum, Erwerben,
 Verdienen, das ausschließliche Überlassen, Vertrauen auf die göttliche Gnade in Christo
 oder auf Christum selbst." Weiss. And so faith, principally, according to its essence & concept,
 excludes all boasting from itself, would cease to be faith, if it would boast of anything, of any of its
 own actions before God.

This presents itself (103v, v. 27) from the previous amplification of the apostle. But now he
 once again comes back to that which he had taught in vv. 21-26 regarding the way & manner of becom-
 ing justified, includes this in a short summary & proves with that the statement in v. 27 that now all
 boasting is excluded: $\delta\omicron\upsilon\iota\ \varsigma\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\beta\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu\ \chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \omega\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\iota\ \nu. 28$.
 "Denn wir halten dafür, dass der Mensch gerecht werde ohne des Gesetzes Werke".
 (Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the Law).
 Evidently this sentence is a short summary of the Pauline doctrine of justification, as Paul had
 presented it in vv. 21-26, and so very correctly it has become a sort of the motto of the Lutheran
 Church: "So halten wir es nun, dass der Mensch gerecht werde ohne des Gesetzes Werke, allein durch
 den Glauben." But thereby it is not said that the reading $\delta\omicron\upsilon\iota\ \varsigma\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ is favored by the context. For
 then one must refer this $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ back over v. 27 to vv. 21-26, which would be awkward, while the better
 attested reading $\delta\omicron\upsilon\iota\ \varsigma\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha\ \gamma\alpha\rho$ puts in hand a more simple thought connection. For as the entire
 amplification in vv. 21-26, so also its short epitome in v. 28, is a proof for v. 27. The $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$ main-
 tains the emphasis, even when with most codices we place it after the $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\beta\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$. That man, in this
 way, through faith without the deeds of the Law, is justified before God, proves that he cannot boast of
 anything before God. Nevertheless this general sentence, which also has a sentence form, $\delta\omicron\upsilon\iota\ \varsigma\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$,
sensum, even tho it serves as a proof for the foregoing statement, retains its self-evident
 meaning & importance.

In the recapitulation of v. 21-26, expressly describing the mode of justification, faith is named
 only as the means of justification. But "Glaube," faith, $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, is a correlate concept, which
 is not even conceivable without an object. Faith, trust, must have an object, to which it holds, in
 which it confides. Faith always has its object in itself. The object of faith, however, is even the
 grace of God, the redemption which is present in Christ alone, the atonement for sins which was accom-
 plished thru the blood of Christ, the righteousness which avails before God which is effected

134.
3, 27-31.

thereby. To that faith clings, in that it confides. "That the office & essence of faith alone remains, that it alone & nothing else is the means or instrument, where with & whereby God's grace & the merit of Christ in the promise of the Gospel is received, grasped, accepted, applied to ourselves, & made our own." Formula of Concord. Sol. Decl. Art. III. Mueller, Symb. B., p. 518. And now in that man applies to himself, draws to his own person, in faith God's grace, the merit of Christ, & the complete righteousness gained by Christ, he is thereby before the eyes of God, according to God's judgment, righteous, good, perfect, just so, as God would have him. And in that faith trusts to in & boasts of no other thing before God than the free, undeserved grace of God, a work & merit not its own, the merit of Christ, therefore all self-exaltation of man is excluded.

What that means, that man is justified by faith, how far faith justifies, what there is about the justifying faith, how all merit, all boasting of man is excluded thereby, the Apostle now makes still more clear & significant, in that he adds: $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma \ \epsilon\pi\omega\nu \ \nu\omicron\pi\omega\varsigma$. "Without the deeds of the Law," separated from the works of the Law, man is justified. The works of the Law concur hereby in no way, move God not in the least, not even to the slightest degree, to speak a favorable judgment over the sinner; they do not even come into consideration before God, when He justifies man. "Nur durch alle eigenen Werke, Verdienst, Würdigkeit, Ruhm, und Vertrauen aller unserer Werke in dem Artikel der Rechtfertigung ganz und gar ausgeklammert werden, also das unser Werk weder durch noch Verdienst der Rechtfertigung, darauf Gott in diesem Artikel und Handlung sehen, oder wir uns darauf verlassen, möchten und sollten, noch zum Ganzen, noch zum Teil, noch zum wenigsten Theil gerechtfertigt und gehalten sollen werden." Formula of Concord. *ibid.* This modifier $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma \ \epsilon\pi\omega\nu \ \nu\omicron\pi\omega\varsigma$ includes in itself that man is justified by faith alone. Either man is justified by faith or by works. *Veritum non datur.* Now the works are completely separated & excluded. Thus only faith remains. Thus the *sola, sola fide*, the "by faith alone" in the Lutheran translation not only corresponds to the context, but it is given by the text itself. "We believe, teach, & confess that for the preservation of the pure doctrine concerning the righteousness of faith before God it is necessary to urge with special diligence the particular exclusivae, that is, the exclusive particles, i.e., the following words of the holy Apostle writes: Of grace, without merit, without Law, without works, not of works. All these words together mean as much as that we are justified & saved alone by faith in Christ. Eph. 2, 8; Rom., 1, 17; 3, 24; 4, 3 ff.; Gal. 3, 11; Heb. 11." Formula of Concord. Epitome, Art. III. Mueller, Symb. B., p. 529. (Vögel, p. 795.) So also before Luther have the Italian translations of Geneva, 1576, and Venedig, 1585, *per* *la sola fide*, likewise the Catholic Nuremberg Edition of 1583. "nur durch den Glauben" (also in Gal. 2, 16, where Luther does not have the "allein"). And Erasmus writes in his Liber concionandi III: *non sola tot clamoribus lapidatus hoc seculo in Lutheri reverentia in patribus audientibus.* There might still be found a place here for the classic passages from Luther's "Send-

schreiben vom Dolmetschen; in which he justifies his translation of Rom. 3, 28: "I have received your letter with the two 'Quaestiones oder Fragen', wherein you desire my statement: first, why I have translated the words of St. Paul in Rom. 3, *solum* & *allem* *justificari ex fide absque operibus*, into German thus: 'Wir halten, dass der Mensch gerecht wird ohne des Gesetzes Werk, allein durch den Glauben.' And you show at the same time how the Papists make themselves obnoxious over the stuff, because in the text of Paul the word *sola*, 'allein', does not stand, & such an addition is not permitted of mein *hodi* word, etc. Here in Rom. 3 I have known very well that in the Latin & Greek text the word *solum* does not stand, & have not permitted the Papists to teach me such things. It is true, these four letters, *sola*, do not stand therein, which letters the 'Egelsköpfe' look upon as a cow looks upon a new gate. But they do not see that the meaning of the text nevertheless has it in itself, & where one would clearly & forcibly translate it into German, it belongs there. For I have wanted to speak German, not Latin or Greek, since I have undertaken to speak German in Dolmetschen. But that is the way of our German language, when a discussion treats of two things, of which one confesses one thing & denies the other, then one uses the word *solum*, alone, together with the word 'not' or 'none'. As when one says: The former brings only meal & no money. No, now I truly have no money, but only meal. I have only eaten & still not drunk. Have you only written & not read letters? And the same thing numbers times in daily use. In all these speeches, whether the Latin or Greek language does it or not, the German still does it & it is its way, that it adds the word 'allein', so that the word 'nicht' or 'keine' is so much the more complete & significant. For altho' I also say: The former brings meal & no money, then the word 'no money' still does not read as clear & distinct, as if I would say: The former brings only meal & no money; & here the word 'only' brings so much to the word 'no', that it becomes a complete German, clear speech. For one must not question the letters in the Latin language how one should speak German, as these asses do, but one must ask the mothers in the house, the children on the streets, the common man on the market-place about that, & see how they speak & interpret accordingly; thus they understand it then & notice that one speaks German with them. ... But now I have not only confided in, & followed the form of speech that I have added 'allein', *solum*, to Rom. 3, 28; but the text & the meaning of St. Paul demand & urge it forcibly. For he there treats the principle point of Christian doctrine, that we are justified thro' faith in Christ without all works of the Law, & cuts off all works so clearly, that he says, works of the Law, which is still *hodi* Law & Word, do not help to justifications. ... But where one cuts off all works so completely, there the meaning certainly

must be, that faith alone justifies. And whoever would speak clearly & bluntly of such cutting off of works must say: Only faith, & not works, justifies us. That is forced by the matter itself together with the form of speech. Better, what I should have said, is it not much more scandalous, that St. Paul himself does not say, only faith, but pours it out clumsily & utters & says without the works of the Law? And in Gal. 2, 16: 'Not by the works of the Law;' of that much more in other places. For the word, faith alone,

might still find a comment, but the word, without the works of the Law, is so large, provoking, dishonorable, that one can help it with no comment. How much more might the people learn from this to do no good works, since they hear it preached with such barren, strong words concerning works; no works, without works, not by works. Now if it is not scandalous that one preaches without works, no works, not by works, why should it be scandalous, when one preaches this: only faith? ... Tell me, whether Christ's death & resurrection is our work, which we do, or not? Certainly it is not our work, nor a work of the Law. Now Christ's death & resurrection alone makes us free from sin & devout, as St. Paul says in Rom. 4: He has died for the sake of our sins & was raised again for our justification. Tell me further, which is the work by which we grasp & hold to Christ's death & resurrection? It must be no outward work, but alone the bare faith in the heart; that alone, certainly all alone, & without all works, grasps such death & resurrection, where it is preached thru the Gospel. Now then what is it, that one so often & rages, disagrees & burns, as the matter itself basically lies & proves clearly there, that only faith grasps Christ's death & resurrection without any works, & the same death & resurrection is our life & justification? ... Also I am not alone nor the first who says that, only faith justifies before me Ambrosius, Augustine, & many others, have said it. And whoever should read & understand St. Paul, must well speak thus & cannot say anything else; his words are too strong & permit no, absolutely no works. If it is no work, then it must be faith alone.

Here is the place to enter somewhat more closely into the concept *ἔργα νόμου*, "Works of the Law", so that we might become well acquainted with what we have abstracted from the article & treatment of justification. Under the works of the Law the Papists understand the works which God especially binds on the Jews in the: civil law, the ceremonial law. They are now of no more use in the N.T. But "works of the Law" are evidently all the works which God has ordained in the Law; above all things the works of the Ten Commandments, the Moral Law, which are committed to all men, as the Gentiles then have a substitute of the revealed Law in the natural law. All these works are excluded from the article of justification & salvation. And not only the outward works & actions. Men have often pointed the *καρπὸς τοῦ νομοῦ* or *ὄψιν τοῦ νομοῦ* to the fact that the empty outward works avail nothing before God; God looks at the heart; the disposition of the heart gives the real worth to man's works, even before the eyes of God. When God justifies man, He accepts the good will for the deed. That is nothing less, like the papistic meaning, than clumsy perversions of the simple words of Scripture. To "the works of the Law" belongs everything that God demands of man in his Law, & not only the works of the Decalogue, but above all things, also the works, the inner works, of the first Table. Also that man fears, loves, & trusts in God, prays to, praises, & thanks God, etc., falls under the rubric *ἔργα νόμου*. And even all these distinguished works, which concern real worship, these inner works, motives, & decisions of the heart help nothing toward the righteousness which

avail before God. Why man cannot possibly be justified by the works of the law the Apostle had pointed out in the first part of the letter, where he had shown that Gentiles & Jews were sinners. The works of man are evil & cannot please God. Man does not even do & cannot do that which God demands of him in the law like the apparently good works of man, the children of this world, are an abomination before God. For they come from a heart that is estranged & hostile to God. But also the truly good works of the regenerated which the Christians do in the power of the Spirit of God are still weak & defective, imperfect & do not suffice before the eyes of God. For God demands perfect righteousness. And without this the Christians certainly still sin very much every day. And the good that they do cannot possibly outweigh & make harmless that which they do perversely & evilly. Certainly, God looks at the heart. But also out of the heart of the Christian there still arise without intermission evil thoughts of which they must be ashamed before God. And so man's works & his conduct shall never bring it about that he might stand as justified before God & εἰς ἔργων νόμον οὐ δύναται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὅτι ὁ νόμος ὁλοκατέστη ἡμῶν ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτωνοὶ. Rom. 3, 20; Gal. 3, 12. And therefore according to the decree of salvation of God, which nevertheless would have man justified & saved, according to the λογος, each & every work of the Law, outward & inner works, the natural works of the unconverted man, like the spiritual works of the regenerated, are excluded from the judgment which God speaks to man. "The works of the law are not works which the law procures, but works which the law demands, & the law demands all that the Spirit of God effects, even in the just made perfect. And therefore spiritual as well as legal works are excluded." Hodge, "Was weder Naturung, Religion, Tugend oder gute Werke tanquam ... als dazu nützlich und gehörig, eingemengt werden sollen." Formula of Concord. L. 1. Decl. Art. III. Mueller, Sym. B. P. 618.

With the expression ἡμεῖς ἐργων νόμον the Apostle would separate the whole genus of ἔργα, evil & every human action & conduct, from the δικαιοσύνη, therefore he can otherwise write simply οὐκ εἰς ἔργα. Everything that man thinks, wills, & does, be it what it will, be it called what it will, is here excluded, completely cut off, and is also faith itself as a source or root & motive power of the good works. It is a basic perversion of the Pauline biblical doctrine of justification, when modern theologians present the matter thus, as if God, when He justifies man, already sees in the seed, even in the faith, the full fruit. But even when faith exercises "its real active & attributive" & grace & living to the glory of God & the righteousness of Christ, it does not come into consideration before God in questo justification is, not insofar as if man does this & grasps the grace of God in Christ. It is not faith

as a motive in the heart of man, as an act of the human will, it is not the actus apprehensionis, which justifies man, but solely the res apprehensa. Et quicquid est activitatis nostrae in illis Christi receptione vel gratiae divinae oblatione et collatione accedimus, conequam nempe fidei per spiritum sanctum producta est in cordibus nostris: id ipsum in consensum non venit, cum de justificatione nostra agitur, adeo ut fides ipsa, quatenus instrumentum est, recte dicatur

138.
3, 27-31.

opponi non tantum operibus omnibus obedientiae et pietatis sed ipsi fidei, quaeque rebus actus nostri est ejusque virtutis. Lalor, System I, 632. That which justifies man, what moves God to declare man righteous is alone & simply that which faith grasps & clings to, the object of faith. Hodge: "The contrast is not between works produced by the law & works produced by faith, but between works of faith, between what is done by us (whether in a state of nature or a state of grace) & what Christ has done for us." The concept "faith" here corresponds completely with the other: "what Christ has done for us."

Thus, when we would stand before God in time & eternity, when we would be justified & saved before God, we must put away, far, far away from ourselves all our works, all our own thinking, feeling, willing, acting & working, whether it be called faith or otherwise bear the name of beautiful Christian virtues. We are lost, if in puncto critico we reflect over the fact, of what we have done, of how we were minded, that we have still meant it earnestly & uprightly with our Christianity, with our Christian faith. On the other hand, these particulae exclusivae "without the works of the law," "not by works," are a great comfort for us, especially in the hour of temptation, as in the hour of death, when we shall be in great trepidation in looking back upon our life & conduct. According to God's word & will, according to the Gospel we should look away entirely from our own thinking endeavours, & actions; we can & should rest alone in that which Christ has done for us.

It is a commonly applicable statement, which the Apostle has advanced in v. 22. We therefore hold that man, man in genera, ἄνθρωπος, is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Bengel comments on ἄνθρωπος correctly: quemvis, Judaeum et Graecum. To this point contained in the expression ἄνθρωπος is joined the following statement in v. 23, which serves for the establishment & strengthening of the general validity of this rule. "Oder ist Gott nur der Juden Gott?" ("Is he the God of the Jews only?") This question introduces another assumption, which would be settled, even if it had not its correctness in the general rule in v. 22. But Paul emphatically rejects this assumption. "Nicht auch der Heiden?" ("a, auch der Heiden?" ("Is he not also of the Gentiles? yes, of the Gentiles also"). God is also God, Creator, Lord & Judge of the Gentiles, "wenn anders" or "denn" (ἢ ἄλλως) Gott ἑν ist" ("being it is one God"). Εἷς ὁ θεός is a general, also acknowledged by the Jews, likewise elementary truth. And now out of this undoubted axiom, out of the oneness of God, the Apostle draws a conclusion in the relative clause: ὅς διὰ πίστεως ἡμῶν ἔκτισται καὶ ἀποθνήσκει διὰ τῆς πίστεως. According to our German manner we would say: "und so wird er die Bekehrung in Folge des Glaubens und die Verhüt durch den Glauben gerecht machen" ("which shall justify the circumcision by faith, & uncircumcision thru faith"). The διὰ πίστεως is also here the so-called logical future, designates a fact of the present, which presents itself out of the previously mentioned premise. If God is one, one God for all men, Jew & Gentile, then it follows also that He justifies & saves all men.

Jews & Gentiles, in one way, namely, by faith. The matter comes to the same point, whether it reads ἐκ πίστεως, or διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Faith is the means of justification: medium, ἡ πίστις, nothing else. That is & remains, also when one says ἐκ πίστεως. When a sinful man comes to faith, grasps Christ in faith, then as a result of that God regards him as righteous, because in & with Christ he grasps, appropriates to himself the righteousness which awaits before God. The change of prepositions, as we have already remarked above under Rom. 1, 17, serves only to draw attention strongly to the fact that here everything is laid to faith, that here only faith is necessary that man is justified so far as he. And also in our passage here the difference between πίστις and διὰ πίστις is to be maintained as little as elsewhere. Likewise the πίστις without the article, as certainly v. 28 shows, designates the determined faith of salvation, the faith in Christ, the fides justificans. The thoughts presented here, to speak with Luther, are "expounded by the Apostle with uncommon vivacity. They express a central point of the Pauline proclamation: The universality of salvation & the similar way of salvation for Gentiles & Jews, the statement which he was obliged to represent all his life against his Christian (?) adversaries. Even this he treats here with such a certainty of victory, that he considers an exhaustive demonstration of proof as unnecessary, but he permits blow upon blow to fall in short statements, & certainly with apparently such elementary statements that even thereby the impression of the plain unquestionableness of the truths should be made as much the stronger.... One God & one Mediator, one salvation & one way of salvation for mankind which finds itself in similar wickedness — that is the Pauline preaching, that is Christianity itself!"

At the close of this instruction of his regarding justification by faith the Apostle still raises the question in v. 31: Νῦν οὖν καταργούμεν ἡμεῖς τὴν πίστιν; "Nun wir nun das Gesetz auf durch den Glauben?" ("Do we then make void the law thru faith?")? Nun legem abrogamus perfidem? Do we somewhat put the Law, which is still also God's Word & ordinance, out of power & application, in that we would be justified alone by faith, without the deeds of the Law? We reject this question altogether with the words: Μη γένοιτο: ἅλ' ἂν νόμον ἰσχυροίμεν. "Dass es ferne, sondern wir rechtend das Gesetz auf." ("God forbid; yea, we establish the law"), stabilimus, confirmamus. We reserve for later to prove, further how the new obedience necessarily comes out of faith. Luther's comment on v. 31: "Faith fulfill the whole Law, works fulfill not one tittle of the Law."

Summary of the entire presentation, 3:21-31: The Apostle teaches & testifies that man is justified without the deeds of the Law, with the exclusion of all his own boasting & merit, alone by grace, by virtue of the redemption of Christ, & that that is the only way of salvation for all men, Jews & Gentiles.

Chapter IV.

Abraham, An Example of the Righteousness of Faith.

4.1-5

The Epistle now introduces father Abraham into the discussion. He asks how the matter stood with Abraham, concerning the οὖν in the question. Τι οὖν ἐροῦμεν, there applies what Hodges remarks: "The particle οὖν is not inferential, but simply indicates transition. What then shall we say about Abraham?" The particle οὖν univocally imports interrogationibus, et quæ antea dicta immittit simpliciter adnectendis. Arminius. The previous amplification of the Epistle regarding justification, regarding the form & manner of justification, what he said regarding the fact that man is justified without the works of the Law by faith alone, brought about the question of how it stood in this respect with father Abraham. The question arises first of all: How are the words of the first verse to be read? The old codices & translations offer four readings: 1. AFC and many old versions: Τι οὖν ἐροῦμεν ἐδερηκένα. Ἰβραὶμ τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα. 2. DFC and many old versions: Τι οὖν ἐροῦμεν ἐδερηκένα. Ἰβραὶμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα. 3. The Byzantine copies: Τι οὖν ἐροῦμεν Ἰβραὶμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν ἐδερηκένα κατὰ σάρκα. 4. B: Τι οὖν ἐροῦμεν Ἰβραὶμ τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα. The last reading, that of the (Coptic) Vaticanus, which stands entirely alone, cannot come into consideration; even the supergenerous defense of the same by Hilstermann changes nothing in the statu quo. The ἐδερηκένα, which is attested by all other copies & all versions, is in any case to be maintained. And now, whether this ἐδερηκένα had originally stood in back of ἐροῦμεν or back of ἡμῶν, which one can never determine with certainty, is of no consequence for the sense of the words; for also in the first case one can combine κατὰ σάρκα, which stands emphatically at the end, with ἐδερηκένα. In like manner there is no difference of meaning between τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν and the more plausible τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν. With most of the ancient & modern expositors, we follow the third reading which has become the textus receptus, & which offers the simplest, most natural position of the words. But now what is the meaning of this question? Hofmann, Schott, & Luthardt place a question mark behind ἐροῦμεν and explain this 'double question' thus: "What shall we now say? Shall we say that we have found Abraham as our ancestor according to the flesh?" — in that the first one takes κατὰ σάρκα as modifiers of τὸν προπάτορα, Luthardt as modifiers of ἐδερηκένα. To this interpretation, however, as Meyer & Wies correctly judge, there stands in the way the fact that in this case ἡμῶν could not be lacking as the subject of the second question. And whether we have found or received Abraham as our father or ancestor according to the flesh would be a very clumsy expression for the thought, whether Abraham was or had become our father or ancestor according to the flesh. With most of the exegetes we take the words as a unified question, take Τι as object of ἐδερηκένα and draw κατὰ σάρκα.

to ἐργικῆς, and translate & explain accordingly: "Was sollen wir nun sagen, da wir Abraham, unser Vater, gefunden haben nach dem Fleische?" ("What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?")? What had he attained or won according to the flesh? When the Epistle here calls Abraham "our father," then, as Philippi, Meyer, & Weiss also take it, he also includes himself with his Jewish-Christian readers, in general with his fellow countrymen, & points to the physical descent of Israel from Abraham. The Jews boasted of their father Abraham, & rightly so. Of the spiritual fatherhood of Abraham Paul first speaks in v. 11. Now certainly that which the Epistle states first of all here in v. 1 of father Abraham is very generally held, & one expects further information on what he really means with ἐργικῆς, and with κατὰ ἑαυτὸν, and this is also given in the following.

We translate further: "Wenn nämlich Abraham aus dem Werke gerecht worden ist," new. ("For if Abraham were justified by works," etc.), v. 2. The sentence introduced with γὰρ serves as an explanation for the foregoing. Evidently ἐδικαιώθη more clearly explains the ἐργικῆς, and ἐξ ἐργων the κατὰ ἑαυτὸν. What Abraham had attained was justification, the right ownership which awaits before God. And the question now arises: In what manner had he attained this great blessing,

whether it was κατὰ ἑαυτὸν or, what is the same thing, by works? The expression εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν does not have an ethical meaning here, does not stand in contrast to πρὸς τὸν θεόν, does not designate the sin-corrupted human nature, but here, as often, designates the human nature, naturam humanam, hominem (Erasmus). If anyone attains anything by works, then he attains it κατὰ ἑαυτὸν, in a human manner, by his own action, his own accomplishments. Here also the actually good works, which follow from regeneration, fall under the concept ἐργων. With ἐξ ἐργων the heathen who thinks of the good works which Abraham had done, after he had been regenerated, after he had become a servant of the living God out of a servant of idols, & of all the glorious virtues of which the Scriptures boast concerning father Abraham. Likewise the works of one who is regenerated, altho they are accomplished in the power of God, are still the actions of a man, even the actions of this man who was regenerated. All the beautiful Christian virtues are even human virtues, adornment & embellishment of the human nature. Very strikingly Flacius remarks, with whom Calov agrees: *Vix secundum carnem hic significat ex operibus... causa locutionis est, quia care, id est homines in se habent et praestant illam iustitiam, non gratis ei a Deo imputatur, etiam si eam praestet iam renatus, nam illa quoque opera non plane consuetudine.* "That is

thus the question, whether Abraham attained this blessing, justification, as a result of his works, his good works. Certainly in this case he must have rendered a perfect obedience, as the blessed Paulus boasts of Abraham, that he had kept the entire Mosaic Law.

But now, instead of repeating the question with other words, the heathen who thinks what is added in explanation of the same in the form of an hypothesis writes: *Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πίστις ἔστι ἐξ ἐργων*

142.
4, 1-5.

ἐδικαιοσύνη, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔργα. He thereby observes that in the accepted, in the case under question, Abraham everywhere had praise καὶ ἔργα, materia glorianti, foundation & reason to boast of he really had been justified as a result of his works, then he had reason to boast of them, that he had received something, something great, by his own action. And certainly he could then boast of them before God. The meaning which Philippi, Grot, Luthardt, & others find expressed in the ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔργα, that in the supposed case Abraham has praise "over against men", lies entirely outside of the context. Then one must concede, as Philippi also really admits, that "with this interpretation a general & undetermined relation must be given to the δικαιοσύνη". But "according to the entire context no reader could understand ἐδικαιοσύνη otherwise than in this decided sense, true in the solemn, absolute sense of the Apostle", namely, of the righteousness which arises by a deed. Meyer. Weiser. Certainly the thought that Abraham in the case under consideration had praise only over against men & not over against God is unavoidable, when one combines the following ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸ θεόν immediately to ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔργα and takes it as a second part of the question. Then the meaning of Meyer, who also construes it thus, that Abraham, if he had been justified before God by works, had praise before God, but not praise in relation to God, & could then not boast of the righteousness as a benefit received from God, is much too artificial & affected. Still even this construction is of a very questionable kind. According to the entire arrangement of speech one expects an answer to the question raised in v. 1, an expression of the fact, whether the case in v. 2, not as a hypothesis, really took place, & certainly a rejection of that question & this condition is its result. And such a rejection indeed lies in the words ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸ θεόν, if with Calvin, Salom, Reick, Britzke & Weiser we detach them from ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔργα and take them as an independent statement. We therefore take πρὸς τὸ θεόν, which cannot be an oath, which must read πρὸς τὸ θεόν, in the sense of conclusion Deum, in conformity with God, in conformity with the judgment of God. — Hermann's interpretation amounts to the same thing, — and interpret the words ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸ θεόν thus: But no, this is actually not the case, in truth Abraham has no praise before God, he is not justified by works, & certainly in conformity with the judgment of God according to that which God had judged regarding Abraham & the form & manner of his regeneration. For thus it reads further in v. 3, the scriptural way of Abraham, that he had believed God, & that it was counted to him for righteousness. The scriptural testimony of Abraham that he had been justified by faith, in another way, thus not by works. In the scriptural testimony, which is God's word, lies God's judgment regarding Abraham. Thus according to the scriptures, according to the judgment of God, Abraham had not been justified as a result of his works & therefore had no praise before God. Then in the principal clause the Apostle attains to that which his explanation in v. 1 on had aimed, namely, that also father Abraham had been justified before God in no other way than that previously described, in which alone in v. 1, he has been or

Gentiles, are justified before God. That also father Abraham had been justified without the works of the Law, alone by faith. Paul would now present Abraham as an example of justification by faith.

The Scripture quotation introduced in v. 2 is Gen 15, 6, the O.T. classic of the doctrine of justification. The Lord had appeared again to Abraham in a vision had led him out into the open spaces, had shown him the numberless host of the stars, & said to him: "So shall thy seed be." That was almost an unbelievable statement. For Abraham at that time still had no physical son & heir. But Abraham believed God, יִשְׁרָאֵל אֱלֹהִים, really: he rested upon him firmly, depended on, trusted in the Lord, who had given him so great a promise. In the Hebrew expression the Greek corresponds exactly: τῆς ἰσχυρῆς ἐκείνου πίστεως, Abraham believed God, believed, trusted in that which God had said to him. And even this such faith, the Lord accounted to him for righteousness, ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ. The Greek translation only transposes the active into the passive: καὶ ἐκείνῳ ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη, "und das wurde ihm zugerechnet zur Rechtfertigung" ("and it was counted unto him for righteousness").

There is found also here, Rom. 4, 3, as then further in v. 5, 8, 11, 22, 23, 24 in the same chapter, the characteristic expression ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, v. 6, 11, 22, 23, 24 in the same chapter, the characteristic expression ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, v. 6, 11, 22, 23, 24 in the same chapter, the characteristic expression ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ. Even as ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, this marks the justification as an actus forensis, as a judgment of God. In his large exegesis of Genesis, Luther has translated ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ with "gedenken" (remember), in that he remarks that it comes to the same point, whether it reads "zurechnen" or "gedenken". The ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ indeed falls under the rubric "der Gedanke Gottes", "das Niemand trügen noch fehlen" ("the thoughts of God", "which deceive nor fail anyone"). The righteousness, with which we stand before God in life & death, is not a righteousness which is inherent in us, but a righteousness which is found outside of us in God's heart & thoughts. "that makes me righteous, thus the divine majesty remembers me, that I am righteous, that my sins are forgiven." But now we must more closely examine this mighty concept ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, 2, 11, 22. The word ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, which in the Scripture is often used in the derived, general meaning "schließen" (join), "überlegen" (reflect on), "erwägen" (ponder), "erachten" (consider), "maassen" (suppose), "daß fürhalten" (hold as an opinion), originally means "rechnen" (account), "berechnen" (compute); & this strict meaning it has in Gen. 4, in the quoted passages. ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, 2, 11, 22 means: "to account something to someone to share in reckoning, either for something for which he has to bear the blame, or what is beneficial to him." Bremer-Hodge remarks: "The primary meaning of the word ὁ κύριος ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ is to reason, then to reckon or number. ... In strict connection with its primary meaning, it signifies to impute, to set to one's account; that is, to number among the things belonging to a man, or chargeable upon him. It generally implies the accessory idea of treating one according to the nature of the thing imputed. ... It produces no change in the individual to whom the imputation is made; it simply alters his

relation to the law like these objections, therefore, to the doctrine expressed by this term, which are founded on the assumption that imputation alters the moral character of men; that it implies an infusion of either sin or holiness, rest on a misconception of its nature. It is, so far as the mere force of the term is concerned, a matter of perfect indifference whether the thing imputed belonged antecedently to the person to whom the imputation is made or not. It is just as common & correct to speak of laying to a man's charge what does not belong to him, as what does. That a thing can seldom be justly imputed to a person to whom it does not personally belong, is a matter of course. But that the word itself implies that the thing imputed must belong to the person concerned, is a singular misconception. These remarks have, of course, reference only to the meaning of the word. Whether the Bible actually teaches that there is an imputation of either sin or righteousness, to any to whom it does not personally belong, is another question. That the Bible does speak both of imputing to a man what does not actually belong to him, & of not imputing what does, is evident from the following, among other passages, Lev. 1:17: 'What man so ever killeth an ox, & bringeth it not to the door of the tabernacle, ... blood shall be imputed to that man; that is blood-guiltiness or murder, a crime of which he was not actually guilty, should be laid to his charge, & he should be put to death. ... 'his blood-guilt should it be accounted to this man.' &c. &c. On the other hand, Lev. 24:13, if any part of a sacrifice is eaten on the third day, the offering shall not be imputed to him that made it." And so it is said of God that he does not account to man the sins which he has committed, of which he is really guilty: 11 Cor. 5:19: $\mu\eta$ $\delta\omega$ $\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\nu\omicron$ $\sigma\tau\omicron$ $\tau\omicron$ $\pi\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$; Rom. 4:8: $\tilde{\omega}$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\mu\eta$ $\delta\omega$ $\tau\omicron$ α $\kappa\upsilon\pi$ ρ $\iota\omicron$ ς $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ $\lambda\omicron\upsilon$; 11 Tim. 4:16: $\mu\eta$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\omega$ $\tau\omicron$ α $\sigma\upsilon$ ν . On the other hand we read in Rom. 4:11: $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\omega$ $\tau\omicron$ α $\kappa\alpha$ $\sigma\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\omega$ $\tau\omicron$ α $\sigma\upsilon$ ν , *those who are without law, shall their righteousness be accounted.*

An especial manner of speech is: $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\theta\alpha\iota \tau\iota \tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\iota, \tau\omega\iota\tau\omega$ with τ and double accusative, or passively: $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\theta\alpha\iota, \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma \theta\eta\upsilon\alpha\iota \tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\iota, \tau\omega\iota\tau\omega$ with a double τ . That means: *Itu aestimatur aliquid, ut sit aliquid, i. e. ut valeat pro aliquo re, s. tributum alicui rei nis et pondus rei.* Grimm, *Wörterbuch*. In Ps. 106, 31 it is said of Phinehas: $\tau\iota\tau\iota \tau\iota\tau\iota \pi\tau\tau\iota \psi\psi \tau\iota \tau\iota \tau\omega\iota\tau\omega \tau\omega$, $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma \theta\eta\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega \epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\upsilon\nu\eta$ etc. That means, as also Hengstenberg judges: 'The act of Phinehas, reported in Num. 25, 12, which was murder according to the outward appearance, was regarded by God as righteousness, as a good, holy work, & thereby rewarded, that the high priesthood was entrusted to him forever. Here the discussion is not concerning the righteousness, which Paul describes in Rom. 3 and 4. In Rom. 2, 26 we have read: $\omicron\upsilon\chi\iota \tau\eta \alpha\kappa\rho\omicron\upsilon\beta\upsilon\epsilon \tau\iota\kappa \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\iota\varsigma \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\omicron\mu\eta\kappa \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma \theta\eta\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$: 'To a Gentile who is actually not circumcised shall his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision, if he fulfill the Law. In reference to these & similar passages Gremer writes: "Here that to which the word also completely belongs ($\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma \tau\iota \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\iota$), does not bring the reality into consideration, much rather eventually takes the opposite of the same & thereafter establishes the conduct or

behavior. Something is carried over to the subject concerned & accounted to him, which in & for itself is not his, resp. where it reads: $\delta\omicron\upsilon\iota \ \delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\alpha\iota \ \tau\iota \ \tau\iota\upsilon\iota \ \epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \tau\iota$, something is brought to the person in account per substitutionem. The present object steps into the place of the one for whom it applies; it is substituted for it. And thus he explains the sentence $\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\iota\epsilon \ \delta\eta \ \tau\omega \ \tau\eta \ \delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\alpha\iota \ \eta \ \tau\iota\delta\iota\varsigma \ \epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$, in Rom. 4, 2. 5. 9. 22: "Faith steps into the place of righteousness." To Abraham was his faith, which in itself was something else, accounted as righteousness. The faith of Abraham had in et per se condue justitias. Abraham, who possessed no recognized righteousness which satisfied God, was nevertheless regarded & treated by God as righteous when he believed God. According to the matter it is the same thing whether it reads that Abraham was accounted his faith as righteousness, or that he was justified by faith.

But we must also be mindful here of that which we said above regarding the judgment of justifications, that it is no empty fiction, no empty imagination, but has a fundamentum in re. It was no arbitrary act that God accepted the faith of Abraham as righteousness. We must still discuss in detail the question, why & how far Abraham's faith was accounted to him for righteousness. Tholuck, Blehausen, Meander, & others find the basis for this in the moral worth, the moral quality of the faith of Abraham. This

) God-pleasing disposition, his inner trust in God, God had accepted as a complete fulfillment of the Law. One supposes that only with regard to its nature, not in relation to its content does the faith of Abraham correspond to the faith of the Christian. So also Weiss, & even Keil, who remarks on Gen. 15, 6: "This righteousness Abraham received through his unconditional trust in the Lord, his undebatable faith in His promises, & his willing obedience over against God's Word." Against this interpretation Philippi voices correctly in energetic protest: "If according to Paul's opinion this faith had justified Abraham as this subjective disposition of the mind, as this spiritual good conduct, as this God-pleasing virtue, then the Apostle himself would have thereby cut off the nerve of his doctrine of justification. For we have understood that according to the same faith justifies man before God not for the sake of its subjective nature, which assertion is to be designated as a falling back into the legal standpoint, but that faith only justifies man for the sake of its object & content, which is nothing else than Christ or God's forgiving grace in Christ. Abraham also knew & grasped in faith the promise of this grace & this faith was accounted to him for righteousness." With that Keil agrees essentially: "Not just any outward legal work, but faith justified Abraham, at that time still the uncircumcised one, before God - a pre-Christ

) scriptural testimony for the fact that man attains a righteousness which avails before God not in the way of the Law, but in the promise which brings to him salvation; & that this righteousness, far removed from being self-effected, according to its foundation stands as one accounted in the faith which grasps the proffered salvation in Christ. Otherwise the promise which was passed upon Abraham had Christ as its goal (sub innumerabili illa posteritate latet Christus, remarks Hummel), the faith in

which he took that in faith in the promised Seed, & Jesus, in whom Abraham rested in faith, is God the Redeemer." Meyer also emphasizes that the justifying power & significance of the faith of Abraham has not lain in its subjective nature, but in its content. That is not dogmatic interpretation or preservation. That lies in the text itself. In Gen 15, 6 the emphasis lies on the fact that Abraham had believed God, that which God had spoken to him, that which He had promised him. Not that Abraham believed in God in general, believed & obeyed the word of God, but that he believed the promise, which was counted to him for righteousness. Luther remarks on Gen 15, 6: "Thus now it says here clearly & significantly what faith in itself alone does & works, & not with what kind of virtues or works it is surrounded or adorned. Now, for itself alone faith grasps the promise, believes God in the promise, & since God offers & gives it something it stretches out its hand & takes. That alone of faith is its work." But the content of the promise which Abraham had heard was Christ. It is in that: *sub innumerabili illa posteritate latebat Christus*. Thru the one Seed, Christ, should Abraham gain that numberless seed out of all nations. Thru the one Seed, Christ, should the blessing come over all nations and according to the first Gospel in Gen. 3, 15, this blessing should consist in the redemption from the devil's power, from sin & death. In & with the promise Abraham had grasped the future Christ, Christ & the salvation in Christ. And over this faith, which had such content, was accounted to him for righteousness. The freedom from sin, the righteousness which was to be created thru Christ, which he appropriated to himself in faith, was accounted to him by God as his own righteousness.

To the scriptural testimony concerning Abraham the Apostle, in v. 9, by means of the metathetic *So*, adds an explanation: "Denn aber," or as we can also say according to the German idiom: "Denn nun, der mit Werken umgeht, wird der Lohn nicht zugerechnet nach Gnade, sondern nach Schuldigkeit. Denn aber, der nicht mit Werken umgeht, glaubt aber an den, der den Bettlosen gerecht macht, wird sein Glaube zugerechnet zur Gerechtigkeit." ("Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."). Paul had attested from the scriptures that to Abraham his faith had been counted for righteousness, & this will prove that Abraham had not been justified by works & thus had no praise, it that he assumed it as settled, that faith and works are not compatible with one another, that there is here only one out-out, that man is justified either by works or by faith, *tertium non datur*. Since the thought nevertheless is so close, that Abraham, concerning whom the scriptures report so many & excellent works, might have received something by his works, therefore he still *expressis verbis* calls attention to the diametrical contrast between work-righteousness & righteousness by faith. From that it follows that with Abraham, who had been justified by faith, the opposite, justification by works, was certainly excluded. Nevertheless the Apostle now no longer speaks specially of Abraham, but advances too very generally

held antithetical statements, which appear as loci communes. It is not an historical question which he discusses, in that he asked how it had connected itself with father Abraham, but with the example of Abraham he would teach, would confirm his previously presented doctrine & would place Abraham before the eyes of all future generations as an example of faith & of the righteousness of faith.

It is first of all an axiom from the common human life which Paul introduces here: τῷ δὲ ἐργῶν ἰσμεν ὅτι μισθὸς οὗ τοῦ ἐργαίου, κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον; ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον, μισθός. To a worker who would merit something with his work, who feeds himself with the work of his hands, shall, self-evidently when he carries out his work correctly, the reward be counted not according to grace, but according to debt, as a merited reward. It is no favor & grace, which his employer is due to him, when he pays him his reward, but he gives him only that which he owes him. But now the teacher would evidently know how to apply this generally applicable axiom to the foregoing question, to the action regarding justification. And therefore ὁ ἐργῶν ἰσμεν is the one "who goes about with works" (Gal. 3:10), "a doer of works, to whom the works are the essentials of his life" (Phil. 2:17) as a man who seeks to fulfill the works which God demands of man in his Law, & would thereby appear before God. To the

account of such a man God, presuming that he has perfectly fulfilled the Law, places the benefit about which the discussion is here, i.e., righteousness, not according to grace, but according to debt. It is no proof of the free divine grace & favor, but simply an act of divine righteousness, when God looks upon & treats a man as a righteous one who has fulfilled all the righteousness of the Law. Certainly that is a situation that never takes place in reality.

The antithesis runs: τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργῶν ἰσμεν, τίς τοῦ οὐνοῦ, δὲ ἐστὶ τὸς Σικαιοὺντας. τὸς ἀθεῖς, τοῦ ἐργαίου ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ Σικαιοὺντος. The object of faith is here designated with a singular & significant expression, which most expositors have more or less left ~~unaccounted~~ & disregarded. As the object of faith & trust there appears here the One who is called the God who justifies the godless. Similarly as in Rom. 3:28 with ὁ ὑποκρίνων, as there is meant in our passage with τὸς ἀθεῖς man in general; man according to his form & nature is an ἀθεῖς, a godless one. One could rather somewhat expect as correlate to Σικαιοὺντας and to τοῦ ἐργαίου, the designation τὸς ἰσμεν. But with deliberation the text mentions the stronger expressions τὸς ἀθεῖς. Man has not only infringed upon the divine right, denied God the due obedience, but has deprived Him of the right to ἔσθ' ἔσθ', a the due re-

spect, the due honor, acknowledged Him not as God, as his God, is estranged & hostile to God. And now the godless man stands before God, before God's judgment, & according to all human calculation can be drawn to nothing else than to the judgment of condemnation. But what does God do? Instead of condemning the godless, He justifies him, thus His decree He declares him righteous & that God in His Law reproaches the human judges, that they speak unjustly to the godless, Rom. 7:15, therein He establishes His

honor, His praise. He demands for Himself the right to acquit the godless man. The same situation is pictured here as, for example, in Gen. 3, 15; Isa. 1, 18. The first human beings were drawn into account by God & were convinced of their sin & transgression. Nevertheless God promised them redemption from sin. Israel stands before God's tribunal laden with real blood-guilt. But how does the Lord speak? "If thy sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; if they be as crimson, they shall be as wool." Certainly, God is not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness. Ps. 5, 5. God is & remains under all circumstances the holy & just One. And then He also does nothing of His holiness & righteousness, when He declares the godless righteous. We know, thus the Apostle has previously attested sufficiently, that God justifies the sinner thru Christ, that Christ has atoned for all the godlessness of mankind with His blood & has thus satisfied the divine holiness & righteousness & quieted the wrath of God. Still thereby the contrast between the nature of man & the judgment of God is not made more tolerable to the human reason. It was God Himself who had sent His Son into the flesh & placed & presented Him as $\text{ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ}$. Indeed, it is a wonderful God, the God as He has revealed Himself in Christ, in the Gospel, the God who justifies the godless.

There is no rational explanation for this wonderful judgment of God. For nothing, nothing that is in man, moves or causes God to declare the godless as righteous. Not even the faith of man. To be sure, the Apostle even in our passage characterizes faith as the fides justificans, but in such a manner that this thought is excluded in a dependence of the judgment of justification on God upon the faith of man. In the manner of speaking $\text{πιστὶς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ δικαιοῦναι τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς}$ the δικαιοῦναι of God appears as the logical præ, faith as the logical posterius. That wherein faith trusts, depends, is already there, is on hand, when faith leans upon it. That which faith takes & grasps is a ready, prepared gift. "Faith means to take what is there." Cf. *Abendmahlsfeier* of 1872. One does not explain that correctly which the Apostle writes here, when one explains it thus, that the believer looks confidently to God that He shall justify him. No, that God justifies the godless is presented here as an established fact, which stands firm before faith & independent of faith. And faith looks confidently to this established fact, accepts this fact. On Christ, thru Christ, when He gave Christ into death, God had already declared the godless man righteous in general, & thus He has proven Himself as a God, & thus is a God who justifies the godless; thus it is an attribute of God: $\text{δικαιοῦναι τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς}$. This judgment of God & the God who thus judges are thus given to be known, are presented to godless man in the Gospel. And whoever believes that, believes the Gospel, accepts the judgment of God, which is offered in the Gospel, & looks confidently to the God who thus judges & has judged.

In this passage also faith stands in contrast to works; the believer is described as one who does not go about with works, much rather believes in God, who justifies the godless. Whoever believes, when

he steps before God & deals with God, leaves all his works behind, because he has recognized that with his works, even with his best works, he cannot stand before God; he places himself as a godless one before God & looks confidently to the God who justifies the ungodly. And such faith, as the Apostle writes, shall now be counted to him for righteousness. Here it is completely evident how far faith is accounted for righteousness. Not insofar as it is "a good work or a beautiful virtue," a God-pleasing disposition in general a behavior of man, for the $\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ stands in contrast to $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\iota$, and whoever believes in the God who justifies the godless, recognizes & acknowledges himself as a godless one - but only for the sake of its object, upon which all emphasis lies in this statement. In the manner of speaking, $\tau\hat{\iota}\ \pi\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\gamma\gamma$, faith appears as the logical prerequisite and the becoming righteous as the logical consequence. That does not contradict what we have previously said regarding the relationship of $\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ to $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\omega\tau\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\epsilon\beta\epsilon\gamma$. The matter conducts itself thus. God had already declared the godless in general righteous in Christ, & therefore $\eta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\epsilon\beta\epsilon\gamma$. This judgment of justification, which is pronounced in the Word of the Gospel, I apply to myself thru faith for my own person in individual. And so God holds & accounts me specially for my person, me in individual, as a righteous one. Even to this thought connection the Formula of Concord gives expression in the following words: "We believe, teach & confess that faith alone is the means & instrument, whereby we lay hold of Christ & live in Christ with righteousness which avails before God (which thus is present before faith, has prepared in Christ for all men), for the sake of which such faith is counted to us for righteousness. Rom. 1.5. "Muller, Symbl. B. 1. 528.

What the Apostle attests here applies not only to the so-called first justification, with which man steps out of the condition of sin into the condition of grace, but has its application & meaning for the entire Christian life. Paul writes his Letter to Christians, who already for a shorter or longer period of time stand in grace, & he gives them to consider how man in general, even after he has become a Christian, is justified before God, in what manner alone man can stand before God even in the hour of death & in the judgment. Justification permeates the entire Christian life. The "not by works, but by faith alone" is the rademecum, the daily food & nourishment of the soul of a Christian. And even also the motive, which is brought forth in our passage, that God justifies the godless, is our comfort of faith in life & death. Even if a believing Christian is not a godless one in the sense, as the impatient, unbelieving children of the world are godless ones, still the longer he recognizes it the more he recognizes it, how much godlessness, estrangement from & hostility to God there is still hidden in his heart. And therefore he still clings with faith also to this word, that God justifies the godless. Faith does not conclude thus: I believe, I know in me that I believe on my Savior from the heart. Therefore I am righteous before God. A believing Christian does not feel his pulse, does not make the pulse beat of his life of faith into a criterion of his condition of grace. He

150.
7/1-5.

would thereby forevery badly. For faith often forsakes its own feeling & experiences, & is often troubled over the fact whether his faith is really the right kind. Faith much rather concludes thus: O, how am I still so godless! Out of my heart such wicked, godless thoughts still continually arise. In that there is no doubt that I am still a poor, unworthy sinner. My sin is ever before me. But now God's Word says to me, that God even justifies the sinners, the godless. Thus with-
out a doubt I belong in the number of those whom God justifies. Certainly all godless men should draw this conclusion. That most do not do that comes from the fact that they do not believe the Word & ask nothing about God & the righteousness which awaits before God. I have confessed, as Luther declares in his Centocost sermon on John 3, the certainty of salvation from the words: "For God so loved the world," especially from the word "world": "No one can suppose anything like this with the Word of God. Our dear Lord Christ himself preached that to us, so that we have no reason to doubt such preaching & word, & said, His Father in heaven, the real, eternal God, had loved the world, that He had given it His only begotten Son. Now you & all men must recognize that the world does not mean Mary, Peter, & Paul; but the world means the entire human race in one body, there & there. Do you now believe that you are a man? Or if you cannot believe or know such a thing, then grasp yourself upon the breast or on the nose, whether you do not also have flesh & blood like the other people. Why would you then exclude yourself from this world 'world', because Christ states with bright, clear words, that God has not given His Son only to the blessed Virgin Mary, nor to St. Peter, nor to St. Paul, but to the world, so that everything that is called children of men should take that to them-
selves." Similarly one cannot should also apply Rom. 4, 5: "Do you believe that you are a godless person? Or if you cannot believe such, then only take a look into your heart, how wicked & corrupt it still is. Why would you exclude yourself from the word 'godless'? But now God's Word states clearly that God justifies the godless. Thus also you!"

Finally when one compares the two statements in v. 4 and v. 5 with one another, then one discovers that the two members of the antithesis do not correspond exactly with one another. The antithesis in v. 5 should really run: But to him who does not work but believes the blessing, the righteousness shall be accounted not according to debt, but according to grace. Nevertheless the incongruence remains only in the form, not in the content of the apostolic statement. The *gratia* *in* *proposito*, the concept of grace lies implicit in the words "that justifies the ungodly." It is free, undeserved grace which is the price, praise, & triumph of the divine grace, so that we then declare the godless righteous. And whoever in faith appropriates to himself this judgment, which brings grace upon him, to him shall the righteousness be accounted by grace.

4, 6-8.

1. With that which the Scripture testifies concerning Abraham concerning the form & manner of Abraham's becoming righteous agrees (καὶ οὕτως) a statement of David in the 32. Psalm. David speaks the beatitude of men, pronounces the man happy & blessed to whom God accounts righteousness without works. Weiss remarks very aptly on Rom. 5: 1. Σικαιοῦν γὰρ v. 6: "Here Σικαιοῦν is immediately remembered as that which God brings to man's account with evident reference to v. 5, so that thus this accounting of faith for righteousness is even such a graciously rich imputation of a righteousness which in itself is not present." And further: "καὶ οὕτως as in 3, 28 belongs to Rom. 5: 1 and brings into prominence how this imputation results without a share of works, which would actually constitute the righteousness, & therefore without that merit." David stood in the midst between Abraham & Christ; in him the history of Israel came to its apex. Thus in the midst of the O.T. history of salvation, as in the beginning of the same, thus at all times, there stood open to sinners the same way of salvation & only this one way of salvation, which was now manifested to all nations in the Gospel. Even David, who did not, like Abraham, live before the time of the Law but after the time of the Law, who with his people was under the Law, knew only of a justification of the sinner by grace, without the deeds of the Law. In Ps. 32, 1, 2 he pronounces the sinner blessed, whose sins are forgiven. "The one pronounced blessed thus has not only no works to exhibit, but actually much rather sins & transgressions, which cause him to appear as a sinner. In the forgiveness of them the graciously rich character of the justification comes forth most directly." David had experienced the sin-forgiving grace of God in his own heart, when the Prophet Nathan had spoken to him the absolute forgiveness of God after his severe transgression against Bathsheba & Uriah. And this grace he now recommends to other sinners. He says: ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται, which really means: "Blessed is the one who is unburdened of his transgression." Paul quotes according to the Septuagint: καὶ οὕτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται. The concept "forgiveness of sins" is more closely explained by the two following expressions. To forgive sins, ἀφίεναι, ἀφίεναι, means to take away the sins. Certainly it is impossible to undo the evil which one has committed. The sin remains & works afterwards in its results, as this was the case in the twofold sin of David. But the forgiveness covers the sins before the eyes of God, so that they appear invisible before God the Holy One & are as if they had not happened. Delitzsch. Therefore it reads further: καὶ ὡς ἐάνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται. And this figurative expression "be decken" is then illustrated by the real expressions: καὶ οὕτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔσται. "Delictus non erit ei, deus non deus die sinde nicht gerechnet." "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." will not bring into account, in that He much rather looks upon it as abandoned and done away with. Delitzsch. With the three parts of the sentence of Ps. 32, 1, 2, which paraphrase the concept "forgiveness of sins," Paul would prove that according to David's statement righteousness is accounted to the sinner without works. 1, 6.

152.
4, 6-8. 9-12.

Thus to him imputation of righteousness is entirely synonymous with non-imputation of him, forgiveness of sins. And so our Confession is correct, when it defines the justification thus: *Credimus, docemur, et confitemur vocabulum justificationis in hoc articulo idem significare, quod absolute acceptatio*. Mueller, *Symb. B. C.* 22. It is confusing & misleading, when one makes an actual difference between justification & forgiveness of sins. One to whom his sins are forgiven is even without sin, pure, & righteous before God, just as God would have him. This word (B. C. 22) shows abundantly how Paul understands justification. Not as a moral transformation of man, nor also as a divine acknowledgement of a corresponding moral condition of man, but identical with the forgiveness of sins, thus as an acceptance of man in the eyes of God in spite of a non-existent corresponding moral condition. Lichardt.

4, 9-12.

With the recurring οὖν the Apostle in v. 9 again takes up the expression ὁ πνευματικὸς, which he had used in v. 6, in order to add a new statement to it. He asks first of all: Οὐκ ἀγαπῶν οὖν οὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ ἢ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστί; No matter whether one explains πνεῦμα or ἁγία πνεῦμα, or, what lies nearest, ἐστὶ πνεῦμα, in any case the meaning is: Now does this blessing come upon the circumcision or also upon the uncircumcision? Is the blessing, which David has expressed in the 32. Psalm, come only upon one who is circumcised, as David was circumcised, or likewise also upon one who is uncircumcised? The following sentence: λέγουμεν γὰρ, ὅτι ἐδοξάσθη τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι τὸ ἐν πίστει δικαιοσύνη, with connection with the statement in v. 10, serves as an explanation of this question. Paul refers to an actual fact, on the basis of which alone this generally held question can be answered. "Wir sagen nämlich, dass dem Abraham der blaube zugerechnet wurde zur Berechtigung" ("For we say that, faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness"). That the Apostle had previously stated & he holds this statement firm, in order to apply it according to another side. He turns back to Abraham, with whom he has to do particularly in this entire section of the Letter, chap. 4. The τῷ Ἰσραὴλ has the emphasis. "Wie ist er nun zugerechnet worden?" ("How was it then reckoned?") In what condition did Abraham find himself, when faith was accounted to him for righteousness, in the condition of circumcision, or in that of uncircumcision? The answer runs: Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. He was still not circumcised, when God counted his faith to him — for righteousness. From that it shows itself, that that blessing of David extended not only upon those circumcised, like David & his like-minded contemporaries, but also upon the uncircumcised, like Abraham. Jews & Gentiles, even thru faith, have a share in the forgiveness of sins or, what is the same thing, in the righteousness which avails before God. And even this thought is carried out still

further in the following, no longer in retrospect upon David's statement in the 22. Psalm, but with reference to the history of Abraham.

Paul continues in v. 11: "Und das Zeichen der Beschneidung" ("And the sign of circumcision"), ὁ ἡτοιμασμένος, which would say, in the sign consisting of circumcision, "empty orake Siegel der Gerechtigkeit des Glaubens, den er in der Vorhaut hatte" ("he received a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised"). The Jews, as we have already remarked on this in 2, 25, boasted of & trusted in the circumcision, by which they distinguished themselves from the Gentiles; they regarded it not only as a prerogative, but as a sort of merit; they taught that everyone who was circumcised had a share in the future kingdom. And thus they boasted also of their father Abraham, that he was circumcised, & they thought that he had been beloved & worthy before God already for the sake of this outward sign & work, because he circumcised himself & all the males of his household. Over against that the Apostle calls attention to the fact, first of all, that Abraham had received, Εἰς τὸ σημεῖον, the circumcision, that it was not so much a work of Abraham as a gift of God, & secondly, that Abraham first later, after he had been justified by faith, was circumcised, that therefore neither now nor ever could circumcision be a means or basis of his justification & thirdly, he calls circumcisi-

tion a seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had in uncircumcision, ἐφ' ἧς τὸ σημεῖον τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ. The last modifier τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ does not belong to τῆς δικαιοσύνης, τῆς πίστεως, but only to τῆς πίστεως, as the parallel in 1. 26 proves this. There is also found here the expression τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως, "the righteousness of faith," which does not mean "righteousness, which faith works, which has its foundation in faith" (Philippi), but the righteousness which Abraham received, ascribed to himself. This righteousness of faith was sealed to him in circumcision. This outward sign in the flesh should make him certain of this & did make him certain that he was righteous before God, that he had God for himself. So little did circumcision stand with him in opposition or in contradiction to the justification by faith, the justification by grace, that the latter was much rather confirmed by the former. And that was and remained also the significance of circumcision among the descendants of Abraham. Paul does not deny that circumcision was a nota externa, which distinguished the seed of Abraham from the nations of the Gentiles; likewise not that circumcision in the flesh exhorted to circumcision of the heart, as he himself had called special attention to this in 2, 29, but he here sets forth before every-

one the worth of circumcision, that it was a seal, a confirmation of the righteousness of faith. That agrees with the ordinance & statement of God in Gen. 17, 1, according to which circumcision should be a σημεῖον τῆς συνθήκης, a seal of the covenant of the covenant which rested on grace & on the promise of grace. Likewise in the argum the discussion is regarding the seal of circumcision, as then also the words belong to the formula of circumcision: Benedictus est, qui in te fecit misericordiam

ab utero, et signum posuit in carne, et filios suos sigillavit signo foederis sancti. Moreover, this applies also regarding the N. T. sacraments, especially also regarding Baptism, which corresponds to the O. T. circumcision, that they are signs, seals, pledges of divine grace, of the righteousness which avails before God. In the 13. Article of the Augsburg Confession it reads: *De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sunt, non modo, ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his, qui sunt tunc propositi.*

There follows an infinitive clause introduced with εἰς, whose content we must not inspect in order to be able to judge correctly also regarding the same connection of the same with the foregoing. It reads further in m.b.: εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα τῶν τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν εἰς ἀκροβύτους, "auf dass er wäre ein Vater aller derer, die da glauben bei der Vorhaut" ("that he might be the father of all them that believe, tho they be not circumcised"), altho they are not circumcised, thus the believing Gentiles. In the following part of the sentence, εἰς τὸ ἵσθαι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην, "dass auch ihnen das berechtigt zugesprochen würde" ("that righteousness might be imputed unto them also"), with most of the expositors we take as a fuller explanation of the preceding, the second εἰς thus parallel to the first εἰς; for the relation of the same to τῶν τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν εἰς ἀκροβύτους, be it that one finds the purpose or the object of the faith expressed therein, shows an awkward construction, & appears already included by the εἰς ἀκροβύτους standing in between. The words of the 12. verse are the continuation of the first infinitive clause: καὶ πατέρα περὶ τῶν, and that he was "a father of circumcision". Then in of the circumcised, & now the Apōstle continues with the dative instead of the genitive: τοῖς οὖν ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς, ποσοὶ ἀνὴρ καὶ τοῖς ἀποκριθεὶς τοῖς ἱγυεβλ. τῶν εἰς τὴν ἀκροβύτου τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν εἰς ἀκροβύτους, a father "für die, welche nicht allein aus der Beschreibung sind, sondern welche auch wandeln in der Suretät des Glaubens unsere Väter Abraham, den er in der Vorhaut hatte" ("to them who are next of their circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised"). One says also: ἐπὶ τῇ περιτομῇ, cf. Rom 24, 2; καὶ ἐς οὐρανὸν αὐτῶν θεοῦ καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐβόησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἔβησαν, Luke 7, 21; ποσοὶ γὰρ τῶν περιτομῶν αὐτῶν. Several of the ancient expositors & among the modern ones especially Hofmann now find in the modifier of πατέρα introduced with τοῖς, a double class of the children of Abraham described, first the believing Jews, whom one understands under τοῖς οὖν ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς ποσοὶ, in that one supplements ἡδὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, and then the believing Gentiles, who are supposed to be those who walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham which he already had in uncircumcision, when he was still uncircumcised. It speaks against this, that the supposition is entirely arbitrary that in the first portion of this sentence one must think of the principle thought that these uncircumcised believe, above all, however,

that then first of all in v. 11 b the believing Gentiles are thought of, then in v. 12 a the believing Jews, then in v. 12 b again the believing Gentiles, which would then make the apostolic discussion run zigzag. No, there comes to the eyes of the unprejudiced reader that which next of the examples have found here, that the Apostle in v. 11 b places Abraham as the father of the believing Gentiles, then in the entire v. 12 as a father of the believing Jews, as father of the circumcised ones, but even of those who were so once to whom not only circumcision but also faith is peculiar, who also walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham. Certainly in this interpretation which the correction actually enforces, at first glance the second τοις before v. 12, 10, appears to be irregular, in that with the double τοις the same persons are meant. Philippi, Meyer, Weiss all however agree that one must simply acknowledge this "inaccuracy," "inconvenience," "error," yet with that "consider that negligences of expression are also found in the most eloquent & most correct literary language." Eberhard says: "Then should Paul not have the right to commit even once (as every man a small grammatical error)." Certainly, Paul was also a man, but he has written the letters to the Romans as one of the holy men of God, who were moved by the Holy Spirit. Will not only because we cling to the verbal inspiration, but also from the standpoint of grammar we, with Fritzsche, Hodge, & others, dare to defend Paul against the apparently small reproach of a small grammatical error. The repetition of the τοις in this case corresponds considerably with the Greek idiom. It is sufficient here to refer to the N. H. whom Hiner remarks in his Grammar, Para. 19: That if such nouns, which are joined with a καί, have the same genus, then the article does not stand namely before the second noun - when the combined nouns are considered only as a part of a whole or member of a union. Mark 15, 1: μετὰ τὸν πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἡγεμῶνα τῶν Ἰουδαίων. On the other hand, the article stands in this case, where a genitive follows after the first noun, then the second of a separate group is added, 1 Cor. 1, 28; 5, 10. And Fritzsche writes in his Exegeticon: "The article stands namely before the second noun - when after the first noun a genitive follows, concerning which the principle article does not apparently seem to work forward, as in 1 Cor. 1, 28; 5, 10. "In the first passage we read: τὰ ἔργα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἔξωθεν ἔργα, both concerning one & the same persons; in the latter, καὶ οὗτοι πάντες τοις τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὰ πλεονέκτα, καὶ ὁ πικρὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄσπαστον, here are names of persons, who belong to one group, the winners of this world, included under the principle article, the first τοις, but since the first noun has a genitive with it, forms with this a separate group, therefore with the second noun the article is repeated, which would otherwise be lacking, as the lacking with the third & fourth nouns. And so this rule then operates also, when instead of the nouns there are combined any other substantives or part of speech & when these are joined to one another by means of οὗ μοῖνον ἄλλὰ καὶ indicated by καὶ or ἔτι. And then even in our case the τοις ἐκ πενήτων καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν forms a complicated expression as a separate group, "behind which the principle article does not work forward," behind which the article is then repeated, also the same persons are further described. Correctly Fritzsche quotes as a parallel also Phil. 1, 29: ὅτι ὑμῖν ἐπαύρηται τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὗ μοῖνον τὸ εἶς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ οὗτοῦ τοῦ εἶναι. Here the

156.
4, 9-12.

Spoken of as a uniform gift of grace. $\text{to } \text{v} \text{p} \text{p} \text{r} \text{o} \text{v}$, which, however, carries in itself a twofold thing, $\text{to } \text{v} \text{p} \text{p} \text{r} \text{o} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$ and $\text{to } \text{v} \text{p} \text{p} \text{r} \text{o} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$. There are named two parts of one whole, which in themselves can be combined with one another without an article, but since the first member is not a simple but a compound expression, a separate group, therefore the article does not carry forward, but is repeated before the second member. In our passage the other circumstance is still to be added, that the second designation of the circumcised ones is a participle, $\text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$, and thus the other rule here finds its application: "The participle, which is independent & does not refer to a noun or pronoun, in most cases has the article." Elsewhere, however, in the New Testament, as in $\text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$, especially since to the participle $\text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$ such a large modifier is added, its own article appears much more necessary. Moreover it also corresponds to our German idiom, a natural feeling for language, when in the translation of $\text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$, when we give this sentence part which is introduced with $\text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$ in a relative manner, when we repeat the "welche," which corresponds to the $\text{v} \text{v} \text{v}$, before the second, enlarged member of the relative clause, either in both members we would describe one & the same persons.

Thus Abraham is the father of the believing Gentiles & of the believing Jews, the father of all believers, our father, as Paul calls him, in that he includes himself with all believers. Evidently fatherhood in this sense is meant here. And the meaning is not that Abraham is the author of the faith of the believing Jews & Gentiles, as if the later believers owe their faith to Abraham, but the tertium comparationis, is "the same nature" (Father), "the spiritual similarity of essence" (Weis). The children have the nature of the father, and when fathers & children are like one another, what they have in common, is even the same father. Thus faith, every Gentile & Jew become a child of Abraham. All believing Gentiles & Jews walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham, follow in the example of his faith. Thus it reads also in Gal. 3, 11. "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." But self-evidently that is just young faith. Thus it is written, as Luther once expressed himself, come with Abraham also into the communion of the righteous. To them also, as to Abraham, shall righteousness be accounted. Luther writes: "Thus all those who believe after the example of Abraham are Abraham's seed & share in the blessing, be they Gentiles or Jews, circumcised or uncircumcised." St. Louis Ed., I, 1101. "There must be given to him (Abraham) God's children of such a nature, as he himself, the father had. In so, however, as to have faith, & that he began to be justified & pleasing to God did not come about because of the fact that he could beget children, not that he had circumcision & the Law, but that he believed. Had he not believed, would be a child of the believing Abraham must likewise believe, otherwise he is not a child of the elected, is grace accepted, & justified Abraham." St. Louis Ed., II, 311. That is thus the new thought that comes forth in this section. There is a large, holy family upon earth, at whose head stands Abraham, the father of faith, which is the communion of all believers, from among Jew & Gentile, of all the sinners justified by faith. The fathers, the devout ones before Abraham, naturally also already belonged to this communion. The first believer was Adam.

158.
7/13-16.

quoted in the following, that God had set Abraham as the father of many nations, Gen. 17, 5. For the many nations, which are given to Abraham, whose father Abraham is, are even this seed, the people of all believers, which has been gathered out of all the nations of the earth. And this seed, this people appears in our passage not as object, but like Abraham as recipient of the promise. With Calov, Fruticke, Thüsing, Weger, Hofmann, & others we much rather refer that which Paul here writes to the promise of God, as Gen. 12, 7; 13, 15; 15, 7; 17, 8, in which Abraham is promised the possession of the land of Canaan. The earthly Canaan, however, was only a pledge of the better, perfect inheritance, of the heavenly Canaan. Abraham looked for a city which has a foundation, whose Builder & Creator is God, for the city of God above. Heb. 11, 10. The $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, which is promised to Abraham, as well as to his seed also, is $\tau\omicron\ \delta\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Heb. 11, 10, the new earth & the new heaven, of which Peter writes, 1 Pet. 3, of which also Isaiah had already prophesied. The final $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$ consists in the possession & enjoyment of the future world. And now the Apostle calls attention to the fact that this promise did not come to Abraham & his seed thru the Law, as if one could merit the future inheritance, salvation, by his fulfillment of the Law, but thru the righteousness of faith. That is confirmed by the history of Abraham insofar as to the believing Abraham, who was justified by faith & thus received circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of faith, the promise of the possession of Canaan & with that of the future world was confirmed. As already in his announcement of the theme of the Letter to the Romans, 1, 16, 17, Paul had presented the $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, which is revealed in the Gospel, as the preliminary condition of the $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$, so now also again, where he carries out his principle theme in extenso, he comes to speak of the final goal & the ultimate purpose of the righteousness which avails before God. Whoever is justified before God by faith shall then also inherit the world, which God has prepared for the children of men, the world of God, the glorified world, wherein dwells nothing but righteousness.

That man can never be saved by the Law, by the works of the Law, the Apostle establishes in 11, 17 by the fact that, if there are heirs out of the Law, $\alpha\iota\epsilon\kappa\ \upsilon\gamma\iota\omega\upsilon$, that is, those who are designated according to the Law, those who would receive salvation by the Law, faith is emptied out & the promise destroyed, $\kappa\omicron\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\gamma\upsilon\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\iota\ \pi\alpha\pi\eta\delta\iota\alpha$. The promise, which even points to the future $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, is then abolished with that faith has become empty, unmeaning. That the promise fails in the established one again with foundation in the fact that the Law works wrath, $\nu\omicron\ \nu\omicron$, which means to mean the wrath of God, the opposite of salvation. For $\tau\omicron\ \nu\omicron\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \nu\omicron\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ("where no law is, there is no transgression"), $\alpha\delta\ \mu\eta\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\iota\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \nu\omicron\ \mu\omega\varsigma$, $\alpha\delta\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\ \mu\eta\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$. This sentence, which in this negative form, "without law no transgression," gives itself as a general statement, includes in itself the positive counterpart that the Law always brings transgression with itself. That no sinful man can fulfill the Law is here assumed as self-evident, as Paul had already testified expressly in 3, 20, that by the works of the Law no flesh shall be justified before God. Thus with sinful man the Law always has the transgression of the Law as an effect; the transgression of the Law, however, arouses the wrath of Him who has given the Law. The thought connection, moreover, remains the same, even in 11, 15 we

Abraham in physical manner. The first & foremost promise which Abraham received & which then carried
thru the later promises, that thru Abraham all nations of the earth should be blessed, Gen. 12, 3, places
such expressions as Gen. 15, 5: "So shall thy seed be," & the foregoing, Gen. 12, 5, into the right light. It reads
further in 14: κατέναντι οὗ ἐπιβέβηκε. Gen. 15, 5. The reading ἐπιβέβηκε, which is found only in several
strongly interpolated codices & with several translators & fathers, discloses itself significantly enough
as an incorrect one, thru which one would remove the apparently abrupt transition from the second to the
third person. κατέναντι signifies adequately the classical, κατέναντι, coram, "vor," "gegenüber," "an-
geachtet." The Greek sentence contains an attraction, & this is to be analyzed: κατέναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ κατέ-
ναντι οὗ ἐπιβέβηκε, and not ὅ ἐπιβέβηκε, which would run contrary to the usual Greek manner of
attraction. Thus one has to translate: "vor dem Gott, vor welchem er glaubte." ("before him whom he
believed, even God."). This sentence, however, one cannot, as variously supposed, join to δὲ ἐβένει κατὰ τὸ
πατρὸς ἡμῶν, v. 16, and then treat the G. 7. quotation in v. 12 as a parenthesis. For in the present time, since
the days of Paul, Abraham in the fathers of us all, the fathers of all believers according to actual fact. At his time,
on the other hand, Abraham was at first only before God, in the eyes of God, the father of many believing
children, the father of many nations. When he received that promise, he still stood alone with his faith, since
the sons of promise had still not yet been born. The thought connection therefore demands the com-
bination of the relative clause κατέναντι οὗ with the immediately preceding G. 7. quotation. Out of the
12 Beza's, with Philippi, Locket, & others, we take a supplement such as this: und coram irgeseht. "und
so stand er" - before God, as a father of many nations. This construction, this change of persons, Bengel al-
ready justifies with the remark: Constructio, 12 Beza's, 58, κατέναντι = Gen. 15, 5, similis est illi: 12
21, 5, 7, 12, 2, 10, 11. Matt. 9, 6; conf. Rom. 15, 3. Acts 4, 1. This is an entirely natural continuation of the discussion,
in that the Apostle would immediately add to this spiritual word, in which Abraham is referred to, an explan-
atory statement in which he could speak of Abraham only in the third person. And before God, who had ap-
peared to Abraham & before whom he stood as the father of many nations, Abraham had also believed.

But the emphasis now lies on the modifier of $\epsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$: $\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\sigma\omega\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha$ $\mu\eta$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha$, "den da lebendig macht die Todten und ruft das, was nicht ist, da es ewig" ("who quickeneth the dead, & calleth those things which be not as the things were"). The expression, "who quickeneth the dead," is taken by many expositors only as a general characterization of God the Almighty, according to 1 Sam. 2, 6; Deut. 32, 39, in that one therein somewhat at the same time discovers an intimation of the re-existence of the dead powers of generation of Abraham, which, however, is first considered in the following & of which the hearers & readers of the Letter could still not think in v. 17. Evidently both attributes, which the Apostle ascribes to God, contain the guarantee for the fact that God could also fulfill His promise to Abraham, could & would really make Abraham into that for which He at that time already regarded him, as the father of many nations. But then it appears as the most inevitable thing, that with Origen, Lenzon,

161.
4.17.22.

Schroder, Olshausen, & Ewald we take it for granted that Paul considers even the transformation of the
 many nations into the children of Abraham, children of God, as an awakening from the dead, as he
 then also in Eph. 2, 4-5; Col. 2, 12 describes the conversion of the Gentiles as a making alive from the dead,
 the death of sin, as a resurrection. Even the second attribute, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτι, is explain-
 ed differently by the expositors. The following three explanations here come into consideration. Bonet, Wey,
 Godel, Hofmann, & Luthardt translate καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν with "hecce, ecce, nunc, nomen, 'dixit et factum est',
 nunc, wie daeindeen," & understand the sentence thus, that God had spoken to Abraham of a multitudinous
 posterity, had named them with names, as if they were already present at that time, & they see therein a proof of
 the omniscience of God. But not so much in the omniscience, but much rather in the omniscience of God
 lay the security for the fulfillment of the promise. Meyer, Ruchert, & Philippi take καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν in the sense of
 "gebielen," command. "καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν," like καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, designates the advancing call of the commander, which he
 permits to go out over that which is ruled by him. Cp. Gen. 22, 1; Ex. 12, 26. Meyer: "But in this passage, viz.,
 God certainly orders nothing regarding the seed." Wey: "Already because of the scroll between καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν
 and εὐδοκίαν, the third meaning gains the preference, which is advocated & defended by Krich,
 Köllner, Tholuck, & Wette, Bering, Deitzsch, by Luther & most of the ancient commentators, that one
 refers καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν to the creating command of God, the creative activity of God. Cp. Gen. 1, 4: 'like he
 wrought & does it, calling the generations from the beginning: - εὐδοκίαν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, & the Lord
 the first, & with the last.' Gen. 48, 13: 'Mine hand hath laid the foundation of the earth; & my right
 hand hath spanned the heavens; when I call unto them.' εὐδοκίαν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, they stand together."
 God calls that which is not, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, not essentially different from καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, into being, ὡς
 ὅτι. This second ὅτι is the accusative of the object of the iudicium. Cp. 1 Thess. 3, 13; εἰς τὸ ἁγιάσαι
 τὰς καρδίας, ὡς ὅτι πνεύματι. 1 Cor. 1, 8, 11; 1 Thess. 5, 23. Wey: "Gen. 1, 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000. 1001. 1002. 1003. 1004. 1005. 1006. 1007. 1008. 1009. 1010. 1011. 1012. 1013. 1014. 1015. 1016. 1017. 1018. 1019. 1020. 1021. 1022. 1023. 1024. 1025. 1026. 1027. 1028. 1029. 1030. 1031. 1032. 1033. 1034. 1035. 1036. 1037. 1038. 1039. 1040. 1041. 1042. 1043. 1044. 1045. 1046. 1047. 1048. 1049. 1050. 1051. 1052. 1053. 1054. 1055. 1056. 1057. 1058. 1059. 1060. 1061. 1062. 1063. 1064. 1065. 1066. 1067. 1068. 1069. 1070. 1071. 1072. 1073. 1074. 1075. 1076. 1077. 1078. 1079. 1080. 1081. 1082. 1083. 1084. 1085. 1086. 1087. 1088. 1089. 1090. 1091. 1092. 1093. 1094. 1095. 1096. 1097. 1098. 1099. 1100. 1101. 1102. 1103. 1104. 1105. 1106. 1107. 1108. 1109. 1110. 1111. 1112. 1113. 1114. 1115. 1116. 1117. 1118. 1119. 1120. 1121. 1122. 1123. 1124. 1125. 1126. 1127. 1128. 1129. 1130. 1131. 1132. 1133. 1134. 1135. 1136. 1137. 1138. 1139. 1140. 1141. 1142. 1143. 1144. 1145. 1146. 1147. 1148. 1149. 1150. 1151. 1152. 1153. 1154. 1155. 1156. 1157. 1158. 1159. 1160. 1161. 1162. 1163. 1164. 1165. 1166. 1167. 1168. 1169. 1170. 1171. 1172. 1173. 1174. 1175. 1176. 1177. 1178. 1179. 1180. 1181. 1182. 1183. 1184. 1185. 1186. 1187. 1188. 1189. 1190. 1191. 1192. 1193. 1194. 1195. 1196. 1197. 1198. 1199. 1200. 1201. 1202. 1203. 1204. 1205. 1206. 1207. 1208. 1209. 1210. 1211. 1212. 1213. 1214. 1215. 1216. 1217. 1218. 1219. 1220. 1221. 1222. 1223. 1224. 1225. 1226. 1227. 1228. 1229. 1230. 1231. 1232. 1233. 1234. 1235. 1236. 1237. 1238. 1239. 1240. 1241. 1242. 1243. 1244. 1245. 1246. 1247. 1248. 1249. 1250. 1251. 1252. 1253. 1254. 1255. 1256. 1257. 1258. 1259. 1260. 1261. 1262. 1263. 1264. 1265. 1266. 1267. 1268. 1269. 1270. 1271. 1272. 1273. 1274. 1275. 1276. 1277. 1278. 1279. 1280. 1281. 1282. 1283. 1284. 1285. 1286. 1287. 1288. 1289. 1290. 1291. 1292. 1293. 1294. 1295. 1296. 1297. 1298. 1299. 1300. 1301. 1302. 1303. 1304. 1305. 1306. 1307. 1308. 1309. 1310. 1311. 1312. 1313. 1314. 1315. 1316. 1317. 1318. 1319. 1320. 1321. 1322. 1323. 1324. 1325. 1326. 1327. 1328. 1329. 1330. 1331. 1332. 1333. 1334. 1335. 1336. 1337. 1338. 1339. 1340. 1341. 1342. 1343. 1344. 1345. 1346. 1347. 1348. 1349. 1350. 1351. 1352. 1353. 1354. 1355. 1356. 1357. 1358. 1359. 1360. 1361. 1362. 1363. 1364. 1365. 1366. 1367. 1368. 1369. 1370. 1371. 1372. 1373. 1374. 1375. 1376. 1377. 1378. 1379. 1380. 1381. 1382. 1383. 1384. 1385. 1386. 1387. 1388. 1389. 1390. 1391. 1392. 1393. 1394. 1395. 1396. 1397. 1398. 1399. 1400. 1401. 1402. 1403. 1404. 1405. 1406. 1407. 1408. 1409. 1410. 1411. 1412. 1413. 1414. 1415. 1416. 1417. 1418. 1419. 1420. 1421. 1422. 1423. 1424. 1425. 1426. 1427. 1428. 1429. 1430. 1431. 1432. 1433. 1434. 1435. 1436. 1437. 1438. 1439. 1440. 1441. 1442. 1443. 1444. 1445. 1446. 1447. 1448. 1449. 1450. 1451. 1452. 1453. 1454. 1455. 1456. 1457. 1458. 1459. 1460. 1461. 1462. 1463. 1464. 1465. 1466. 1467. 1468. 1469. 1470. 1471. 1472. 1473. 1474. 1475. 1476. 1477. 1478. 1479. 1480. 1481. 1482. 1483. 1484. 1485. 1486. 1487. 1488. 1489. 1490. 1491. 1492. 1493. 1494. 1495. 1496. 1497. 1498. 1499. 1500. 1501. 1502. 1503. 1504. 1505. 1506. 1507. 1508. 1509. 1510. 1511. 1512. 1513. 1514. 1515. 1516. 1517. 1518. 1519. 1520. 1521. 1522. 1523. 1524. 1525. 1526. 1527. 1528. 1529. 1530. 1531. 1532. 1533. 1534. 1535. 1536. 1537. 1538. 1539. 1540. 1541. 1542. 1543. 1544. 1545. 1546. 1547. 1548. 1549. 1550. 1551. 1552. 1553. 1554. 1555. 1556. 1557. 1558. 1559. 1560. 1561. 1562. 1563. 1564. 1565. 1566. 1567. 1568. 1569. 1570. 1571. 1572. 1573. 1574. 1575. 1576. 1577. 1578. 1579. 1580. 1581. 1582. 1583. 1584. 1585. 1586. 1587. 1588. 1589. 1590. 1591. 1592. 1593. 1594. 1595. 1596. 1597. 1598. 1599. 1600. 1601. 1602. 1603. 1604. 1605. 1606. 1607. 1608. 1609. 1610. 1611. 1612. 1613. 1614. 1615. 1616. 1617. 1618. 1619. 1620. 1621. 1622. 1623. 1624. 1625. 1626. 1627. 1628. 1629. 1630. 1631. 1632. 1633. 1634. 1635. 1636. 1637. 1638. 1639. 1640. 1641. 1642. 1643. 1644. 1645. 1646. 1647. 1648. 1649. 1650. 1651. 1652. 1653. 1654. 1655. 1656. 1657. 1658. 1659. 1660. 1661. 1662. 1663. 1664. 1665. 1666. 1667. 1668. 1669. 1670. 1671. 1672. 1673. 1674. 1675. 1676. 1677. 1678. 1679. 1680. 1681. 1682. 1683. 1684. 1685. 1686. 1687. 1688. 1689. 1690. 1691. 1692. 1693. 1694. 1695. 1696. 1697. 1698. 1699. 1700. 1701. 1702. 1703. 1704. 1705. 1706. 1707. 1708. 1709. 1710. 1711. 1712. 1713. 1714. 1715. 1716. 1717. 1718. 1719. 1720. 1721. 1722. 1723. 1724. 1725. 1726. 1727. 1728. 1729. 1730. 1731. 1732. 1733. 1734. 1735. 1736. 1737. 1738. 1739. 1740. 1741. 1742. 1743. 1744. 1745. 1746. 1747. 1748. 1749. 1750. 1751. 1752. 1753. 1754. 1755. 1756. 1757. 1758. 1759. 1760. 1761. 1762. 1763. 1764. 1765. 1766. 1767. 1768. 1769. 1770. 1771. 1772. 1773. 1774. 1775. 1776. 1777. 1778. 1779. 1780. 1781. 1782. 1783. 1784. 1785. 1786. 1787. 1788. 1789. 1790. 1791. 1792. 1793. 1794. 1795. 1796. 1797. 1798. 1799. 1800. 1801. 1802. 1803. 1804. 1805. 1806. 1807. 1808. 1809. 1810. 1811. 1812. 1813. 1814. 1815. 1816. 1817. 1818. 1819. 1820. 1821. 1822. 1823. 1824. 1825. 1826. 1827. 1828. 1829. 1830. 1831. 1832. 1833. 1834. 1835. 1836. 1837. 1838. 1839. 1840. 1841. 1842. 1843. 1844. 1845. 1846. 1847. 1848. 1849. 1850. 1851. 1852. 1853. 1854. 1855. 1856. 1857. 1858. 1859. 1860. 1861. 1862. 1863. 1864. 1865. 1866. 1867. 1868. 1869. 1870. 1871. 1872. 1873. 1874. 1875. 1876. 1877. 1878. 1879. 1880. 1881. 1882. 1883. 1884. 1885. 1886. 1887. 1888. 1889. 1890. 1891. 1892. 1893. 1894. 1895. 1896. 1897. 1898. 1899. 1900. 1901. 1902. 1903. 1904. 1905. 1906. 1907. 1908. 1909. 1910. 1911. 1912. 1913. 1914. 1915. 1916. 1917. 1918. 1919. 1920. 1921. 1922. 1923. 1924. 1925. 1926. 1927. 1928. 1929. 1930. 1931. 1932. 1933. 1934. 1935. 1936. 1937. 1938. 1939. 1940. 1941. 1942. 1943. 1944. 1945. 1946. 1947. 1948. 1949. 1950. 1951. 1952. 1953. 1954. 1955. 1956. 1957. 1958. 1959. 1960. 1961. 1962. 1963. 1964. 1965. 1966. 1967. 1968. 1969. 1970. 1971. 1972. 1973. 1974. 1975. 1976. 1977. 1978. 1979. 1980. 1981. 1982. 1983. 1984. 1985. 1986. 1987. 1988. 1989. 1990. 1991. 1992. 1993. 1994. 1995. 1996. 1997. 1998. 1999. 2000. 2001. 2002. 2003. 2004. 2005. 2006. 2007. 2008. 2009. 2010. 2011. 2012. 2013. 2014. 2015. 2016. 2017. 2018. 2019. 2020. 2021. 2022. 2023. 2024. 2025. 2026. 2027. 2028. 2029. 2030. 2031. 2032. 2033. 2034. 2035. 2036. 2037. 2038. 2039. 2040. 2041. 2042. 2043. 2044. 2045. 2046. 2047. 2048. 2049. 2050. 2051. 2052. 2053. 2054. 2055. 2056. 2057. 2058. 2059. 2060. 2061. 2062. 2063. 2064. 2065. 2066. 2067. 2068. 2069. 2070. 2071. 2072. 2073. 2074. 2075. 2076. 2077. 2078. 2079. 2080. 2081. 2082. 2083. 2084. 2085. 2086. 2087. 2088. 2089. 2090. 2

162.
4, 17-22.

present, by His powerful creating word. And even to this the faith of Abraham turned. Abraham had believed before God. He conducted himself completely over against God so, that he believed that which God said & promised to him. Already in Gen. 15, 5, after God had said to him, "So shall thy seed be," he had the testimony that he believed the Lord. And so he also accepted in faith the other, similar promise which made him the father of many nations. The principle object of the faith of Abraham, like the promise of God, was, as we have already remarked on 4, 3, Christ & the salvation in Christ. With this promise, however, stood the other, that thru Abraham all the generations of the earth shall be blessed, that many children, like minded with Abraham, from all nations shall become partakers of the salvation in Christ. And that Abraham also believed this latter, believed the God who quickens the dead & calls into being that which is not, is important for the characterization of the faith of Abraham, shows very significantly the nature of his faith. And thus already with the words κατέκρινεν οὐρανὸς ἔτι βίβλου εἰς θεόν there begins the unfolding of the principle thought of this new section, which Coloss. strikingly gives again with the words: *certum est, tradere hic apostolum descriptionem illius merae et sinceræ fidei, per quam justificari nos hactenus docuit. Vides alio emphasizer, "that already here (v. 17) the discussion has its center of gravity in the portrayal of the Abrahamic faith."*

— In v. 18 the faith of Abraham is more closely characterized with the words: οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ ἔτι βίβλου εἰς θεόν. Abraham had believed against hope, that is, where according to human reckoning & according to the course of nature nothing was to be expected, in that that promise of a numerous posterity contradicted the natural development of things, & (he believed) on hope, that is, "not 'on the foundation of hope,' but 'on toward hope' ("auf Hoffnang hin"), in that he stretched himself out with longing desire toward the promised blessing. The passages alluded to by Krümm, prove that ἐπὶ is used con- dativo and also de consilio et fine: Gal. 5, 13; 1 Thess. 4, 4; Eph. 2, 10; Phil. 4, 10. The faith of Abraham is here placed under the point of view of hope, since the faith of the Ch. do not stretch out to future things & blessings. The modifiers εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν we do not take as the object of the faith of Abraham, since πατέρα ἐθνῶν εἰς is never otherwise construed with the infinitive, & the object, to which Abraham's faith was directed, is given of itself in the context, but with Luther & other old commentators, with Rückert, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, & Luthardt in the teleological sense, as the εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι etc., v. 11, & translate thus: "auf dass er würde ein Vater vieler Völker" ("that he might become the father of many nations"). Loien: εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι etc. significat finem, scilicet, ratione directionis divinæ, quia Deus fidem operatur est insignem in corde Abrahami, ut in agm. etiam contrarium credat, quæ eroderet in se ac constitueretur divinitus, pater omnium credentium, ut hic omnibus gentibus eam præstet, ut non male hic loquatur. With that faith of Abraham, which was certainly His work, God had aimed at the fact that he would be the father of many nations. Many nations should walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham which is

163.
4/17-22.

portrayed here & even thereby become children of Abraham. And so it is a characteristic of all believers here that they believe against hope in hope. The Christian faith goes directly against nature and reason. The closing words of the 17. verse: καὶ τὸ εἰρημύνειν: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι τὸ σπέρμα σου, "ge-mace dem, das zu ihm gezeit war: Also wird dein Same sein!" according to that which was spoken, "so shall thy seed be," we naturally refer to the immediate preceding. That Abraham should be a father of many nations: Gen. 17, 6, 5, stood in conjunction with the word of God, which he had already heard earlier, Gen. 15, 5: "so shall thy seed be," that is, as numerous as numberless as the stars of the heavens.

There follows in v. 18-21 a further statement regarding the faith of Abraham, which joins itself to the ὅτι ... πιστεύειν in v. 17, certainly only loosely, so that it is not necessary for us to continue the relative construction in the German translation: καὶ μὴ ἀβδυνήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε τὸ εἶναι τοῦ σώματος ἡδὴ νεκρωμένον, ἔκαστου τὰ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τὴν νεκρωσίν τῆς μητρός. Σάρξ δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει. ὥστε δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πληροορηθεὶς, ὅτι, ὁ ἐπαγγελία δινατός ἔβη. καὶ ποιεῖται. Expositio est jam dictorum, in qua fides et fidei Abrahamis naturam et incrementum egregie designat nobisque commendat atque circumstantia personae et rei, quae et qualis eius fides fuerit. Körner.

First of all we must become acquainted with the correct reading & construction of this sentence structure. It is unnecessary & of no necessity for the sense of the apostolic statement, whether one reads or does not read the ἡδὴ before νεκρωμένον, as well as whether one reads or strikes out the καὶ before πληροορηθεὶς. On the other hand, the οὐ before κατενόησε deserves special consideration. In D^EF^G A^K we read this οὐ, while it is lacking in B^C. Following these latter witnesses, Weiss, Holmann, Luthardt, Rodet, Ebrard and others take μὴ ἀβδυνήσας τῇ πίστει κατενόησε as one concept in the sense that Abraham had regarded his & his wife's deadness without weakness of faith, & take the following ὥστε as ὥστε μετὰ - (συντικόν) or in the intensifying sense. With most commentators we retain the οὐ, which perhaps, as Philippi & Meyer presume, was omitted from the text by a copier, because it appeared to contradict that which is reported in Gen. 15, 12. For the contrary relations, in which v. 19 and v. 20 apparently stand to one another, demands a negation before the verbum finitum of the 9. verse. To the μὴ ἀβδυνήσας τῇ πίστει in v. 19, evidently, ἔδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει in v. 20, the consideration of the deadness of the body in v. 19, which was negated, is contracted to the reference to the promise of God in v. 20. But,

In order to let the faith of Abraham appear so much greater & so much more amazing, the Epistle inserts another contrast to this contrast, in that he puts the words οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ὡς καὶ before the ἔδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει in v. 20. Hereby it is to be considered that the first contrast is introduced with ὥστε, which in this connection means quoniam, "withal", "hingegen", "vielmehr", "in that here there is brought into prominence the fact that instead of that which is negated in v. 19 that

164.
4/17-22.

which is mentioned in v. 10, took place with Abraham; the second on the other hand, is introduced with *ἡδὴ, and, ἔκδοσι* in that faith, *πιστις*, forms the direct opposite to unbelief, *ἠπιστά*. *ἡδὴ* had already combined it thus: the genuinum *esse o. v.* vocabula *ἡδὴ* oppositionem inferens v. 10 docet, quod ne librorum quidem praeterisset, si *P. simpliciter* oppositione contentus scripseret: *καὶ μὴ ἂν ὁ βέβαιος τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε... ἔαπερ, ἐν ἡδὴ συνάμωβῃ ἡδὴ τῇ πίστει, ἡδὴ, etc.* but quod magis firmum Abrahami, fides exaggeretur, novam v. 10 oppositionem inter v. 9, annectere maluit: *ἡδὴ ἡδὴ τ. ε. ο. v. ἡδὴ πάλιν τ. α., ἡδὴ ἡδὴ συνάμωβῃ τ. π.* We translate accordingly: in der in dem er sich schwach wurde im Glauben, beachtete er nicht seinen eigenen schon oder toten oder lebenden Leib, in dem er etwa hundertjährig war, und die Ersterblichkeit der Mutter des Kindes Sarahs; vielmehr in Hinblick auf die Versicherung Gottes zweifelte er nicht im Glauben, sondern wurde stark im Glauben, indem er Gott die Ehre gab und überzeugt war, dass was er versprochen hat, er auch mächtig ist zu thun. "And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb; he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; & being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was also able to perform."

After this necessary formal discussion we examine more closely the individual statements of the preceding passage. The Epistle thus describes the faith of Abraham, first negatively, denies that he was weak in faith, that he considered his & his wife's physical deadness. He refers here to that which is reported in Gen. 17. When Abraham was almost 100 years old, when he was 99 and his wife Sarah was 90 years old, when he had already lost the power of procreation & Sarah had lost the power of conception, God gave him this promise: "I will be thy great & glorious Father, & thou shalt be called Father of many nations." And He promised him further that He would give him a son by Sarah. Gen. 17, 16. Both promises stand in close continuity. Through Sarah's son Isaac Abraham should gain, first of all, a numerous physical posterity & also the one true, living & through him the numerous spiritual seed. That Abraham & Sarah in their old age should still become father & mother certainly appears unbelievable; it went against all human expectation & directly against the course of nature. It would not have been astonishing, if Abraham had become weak in faith, if Abraham had doubted the promise of God. But, no, he did not become weak in faith & proved that by the fact that he did not consider his & Sarah's deadened bodies: "being not weak in faith, he considered not, etc." *καὶ μὴ ὁ βέβαιος τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε* etc. v. 12. The dative *τῇ πίστει* is the dative of relation. *κατανοεῖν* those commentators who strike out the *οὐ* out of the text take in the sense of *ἀναθεῖν* (consider, "gewahren") in that they lay the stress on the preceding modifier & explain the words, that Abraham, without becoming weak in faith, considered his & Sarah's deadened body. But *κατανοεῖν* also signifies "to fix the attention on something," *considerare* in re defigere (Krüger), "to take heed to something." In Luke 12, 24; Heb. 2, 1; 12, 24 Luther has repeatedly repeated the expression with *abermachmen* (aberm., consider, perceive): "Nicht schwach im Glauben"

165.
4/17-22.

("consider the heavens"), "Nehmet waken die Himmels und Erden an", "consider to the earth and heaven".

"Daset uns unter einander an, albet waken in" ("let us consider one another"). And that is the sense of the word in our passage also. And now the Epistle emphasizes that Abraham did not consider his & his wife's condition of body. He had not observed that, with his thoughts he did not remain clinging to that, reckoned not with that which lay before his eyes, what he felt & experienced, his physical nature, but nature, reason, feeling, & experience entirely out of his mind, & showed even thereby that he had not become weak in faith.

But how? Does the judgment of Paul concerning Abraham agree with that which we read in Gen. 17:17? It reads there: "Then Abraham fell upon his face, & laughed & said in his heart, Shall I child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? & shall Sarah that is ninety years old bear?" Is that not a question of doubt? Several commentators think this & then remark that Abraham had not given much room to the doubting, but had soon overcome the weakness of faith. Still it is certain is that in the life of all believers there are still many weaknesses of faith & that Abraham also became weak in the midst of faith, for example, when he took Hagar as his wife at the demand of Sarah still it would be strange, if the Epistle even in such a case, where the C. H. records a weakness of faith of Abraham, had praised Abraham, that he did

not become weak in faith. We therefore hold that Luther was correct, when he thus sets the exegesis on Gen. 17, 17: "Such are in no way the words of one who doubted, but who was amazed & rejoiced for joy; as then also laughter is a sign of boundless joy in the heart. ... For here Abraham dismissed from his eyes & heart the son of Hagar, whom he had previously held so fondly & lovingly, as the one upon whom stood the hope of the blessing. He thereby forgot his deadened body & his aged Sarah, who now daily went toward the grave, & saw certainly that he should still have an heir from her. Therefore he laughed & rejoiced, & also afterward out of the same laughter & impossible spiritual joy a name was given to the child & he was called Isaac, as the eternal remembrance & token of a beautiful, steady, & certain faith, out of which the holy man, when such words had hardly been expressed by God, became so full of great joy." St. Louis Edit. 1, 1103, 1104.

Now in v. 20 the positive side is brought forth. Instead of becoming weak in faith Abraham was much rather strong in faith, & certainly $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \epsilon\pi\alphaγγελ\iota\alpha\nu\ \tau\omega\ \theta\epsilon\omega\ \kappa\alpha\theta'\ \alpha\tau\tau\iota\nu\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\alpha\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, or still more exact & strictly: "im Hinblick auf die Verheissung Gottes" ("at the promise of God"). He turned his eyes away from his own deadened body & from the deadness of the womb of Sarah, & to the contrary, toward the

look his look of faith, directed & unmoved to the promise of God. It was God's promise; God had promised him this unbelievable thing, in that he submissively, in God's word's promise, God's power became mighty in him, & thus he was strong in faith. This thought is still strengthened by the inserted antithesis: $\alpha\delta\ \epsilon\iota\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota$. The Ep. gives this presents the doubt as an inconsistency, an inner thought controversy. We do not take the dative $\tau\eta\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota$ as instrumental, but like the double

175 It is not as dotinua orationis. Unbelief in the more general concept, & that expresses itself in the fact that one calls into question that which God has said & promised. But that was not the case with Abraham; he did not doubt in unbelief. What he saw, felt, & experienced before his eyes, was indeed suited for awakening doubting thoughts in him, but he did not give room to such thoughts, & thus God's word and promise always gained more room in his heart, & thus he grew strong in faith. That the statement offered here in v. 20 is thus generally held, especially what has been said concerning the growing strong, & concerning the growth of the faith of Abraham, points to the fact that the Spirit no longer has in mind exclusively that one act of faith reported in Gen. 15, but would mark generally the habit of Abraham, the father of faith.

Yes, Abraham is the father of us all. And so also the faith of all believers of all times has the same nature & quality as the faith of Abraham. According to God's decision Abraham is the prototype of faith. We can & should learn in his example of details how the justifying, saving faith is disposed, which, as Luther says, in faith's own work. Real faith, & we can now also say, the Christian faith, looks away from that which lies before the eyes, from one's own person, from one's own weakness & infirmity, & that means, turned to ourselves, from one's own sinfulness & depravity, & looks alone to the promise of God, which has essentially the same content for us as for Abraham, which is Christ & the salvation in Christ. Faith does not reckon with that which one observes around & about oneself, & in oneself, what one feels & experiences in one's own heart, but much rather goes outside of itself, to the promise of God, which outside of ourselves stands eternally firm. Faith & promise are, as our Lord often brings to our attention, correlata. In the Epitaphy we read in one place: "For only faith in the heart looks to the promise of God." Luther writes: *Aligui habent ext. ratio, cur nostra theologia sit certa, quia sapit nos & conspectu nostro et posuit nos extra nos, et non nitamur viribus, conscientia, seu persona, seu opibus nostris, sed eo nitamur quod est extra nos, hoc est promissione et veritate Dei, quia fallere non potest.* *Id. Relat. Epit. Aug. 5, 15-17.* How does it then stand with us Christians, how does our life of faith manifest itself? When we look to ourselves, when we look into our heart & life, there we still find very much in, perversity, & unrighteousness, & often feel in our hearts & conscience the terrors of death & of condemnation, & then it would appear to us unbelievable & impossible that God should still be gracious to us & save us. Many find it far harder to believe that God can love them, notwithstanding their sinfulness, than the hundred-year-old patriarch did to believe that he should be the father of many nations. "Hodge. But we do not permit ourselves to be misled by that, overcome the doubt which arises out of the natural heart, listen not to the voice of our own heart & conscience, but listen alone to the voice from above, to the promise of God, which promises us in Christ salvation, grace, forgiveness of sins, righteousness, life, & blessedness, & we know what God's word says to us is the truth, is more firm & certain than what our own heart tells us. And the longer and more perseveringly we sink & plunge heart, mind, & thought into God's Word, just so much more shall we

167
4/17-22.

become strong in faith & become full of the Word & the grace of God. That is the habit of the believer. Self-evidently with that passing weakness of thought are not excluded. But if at one time we would become weak in faith & have become weak, then one look to God's promise by the same again, pressur from ourselves, & transfer us again into our own element, & that is even God's Word & promise.

The participial clause in v. 20:b and v. 21: So is, So is: $\tau\omega\ \beta\epsilon\omega$, etc. "indem er Gott die Ehre gibt" ("giving glory to God") etc., brings nothing new into that which was said previously, brings no new impulses to faith, but mentions what happened with the previously portrayed faith of Abraham ex ipso. Especially that that Abraham looked directly to the promise of God, he gave glory to God. And that happened generally. Real faith gives the glory to God. Man gives God the glory when he recognizes, acknowledges, praises, values in deed & feels God as that which is. Man as a creature of God gives God the glory, in that he recognizes & confesses Him as the almighty & gracious Creator, thanks Him for His benefits, & then also acknowledges Him as the Lord & Master of his life, fulfill the Six's words $\tau\omega\ \beta\epsilon\omega$, which already in creation had been written in his heart. Man gives God the glory, when he walks about in the bounds which the Creator has drawn around His creation, & deals & walks according to God's will & commandment. This due honor men have withheld from God, as the Epistle had proven in the last chapter of our Letter. And in this

verse also in our message men have variously taken & considered the $\text{So is: } \tau\omega\ \beta\epsilon\omega$, to speak with many, that Abraham with his faith had fulfilled the essential obligation of the creature over against the Creator. Then the faith of Abraham's faith in general appears essentially as obedience over against God & God's commandment, as a fulfilling of the Law. But with this meaning the nerve of faith is covered. Here in Rom. 4 we certainly do not find ourselves in the sphere of the creation & of the Law, but in the province of redemption & of the Gospel. What "giving glory to God" means here in Rom. 4, we see from the context. That Abraham's faith was directed simply & only to the promise of God, even by that, as we have already remarked & above, he gave glory to God, & this relationship of faith to the promise is still further set into the light by the following words $\tau\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \text{Su v. } \tau\omega\ \beta\epsilon\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \beta\epsilon\omega$, which thus serves for the explanation of the first part of the participial clause, just the same whether one reads $\kappa\alpha\iota$ before $\tau\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\iota\varsigma$ or not. Abraham was convinced more precisely: firmly & fully convinced of the fact that God could also do what He had promised him, that He would & would make him the father of many nations, that He would & would thru his seed prepare the salvation for all the nations of the earth. He had no conditional trust in the power & grace of God, thru

which the fulfillment of the promise was guaranteed. And that is faith in general: $\tau\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\iota\varsigma$, firm conviction, certainly a certainty worked by God Himself. Whoever believes trusts to God, that in spite of his own unworthiness & impotence He shall surely give him that which He has promised in Christ, namely, righteousness, life, & salvation. Therefore the faith which makes one devout & righteous before God is not alone this, that I know the historical facts, how Christ was born, suffered, etc. His death also

know that), but in the certainty or the certain, strong trust in the heart, since I hold with my whole heart the promise of God as certain & true, thru which there is offered to me without any merit on my part the forgiveness of sins, grace, & all the salvation thru the one Mediator, Christ. *Lyology, Mueller, Symb. B., p. 95* - labor remarks on Rom. 7:21: *Non persuasionem tantum, sed firmam fiduciam* To *fidem* populi dei import, cum quibus quasi plenae velis fiduciae sua, fertur ad eam rem, quae conficit, metaphoras a nervibus desumptas, nec cum vulgatis reddente plenissime sciens et Papistis rebor- endum ad intellectum, sed ad voluntatem potius ac cor. ... *Pertinissime accitur nomen fidei in evangelio, cum ei tribuitur solus aut concurrit omnium, quae volumus, completi utrumque, namque et assensum illum firmum in credendis de deo et Christo, et fiduciam ex illius omni- potente bonitate conceptam.* He still quotes what *Flacius* once said concerning Luther's hope cum piae memoriae *S. Martinum Lutherum*, plena in deum fiducia, laetique et erectae frontis in templum vadentem intuitus sum, eoque actone plane igno & iam dignas gerendi, risus mihi sum illam longe maximam novum (quam illi *habeant* novant) omnibus velis nento inflatus contra hostes pergentem currere. And even with such confident, victoriously confident faith man gives glory to God. He recognizes Him thereby as the One who has revealed Himself in His word, as the omnipotent, glorious, Redeemer & Savior of mankind. Whoever truly trusts God & His prom- is honors God, not in that with his actions & works he promotes the glory of God, but in that he gives up all claims to all his own work, goes out of himself, permits God alone to rule, do, & work, & only simply takes that which God promises, gives, & presents to him. One should anyone truly be greatly amazed, why the oppo- site still teach very little or nothing regarding faith, still they look very closely into all the syllables of the Bible. And faith is lauded & praised as the highest, noblest, greatest, most pleasing worship of God. ... *Illius* He (God) would be honored, that we should take & receive from Him grace, salvation, & every blessing, & namely out of grace, not for the sake of our own merit. *Lyology, Mueller, p. 95.* Yes, such worship of God, as when man only takes & receives from God grace, salvation, & every blessing is much better, greater, higher, nobler, holier, & God-pleasing than when he honors & praises God with his work & conduct.

With the remark: *"Darum wurde es auch ihm zur Gerechtigkeith gerechnet"* ("Therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness"), namely, the faith, *7:13* *7:13*, v. 12, which points back to 7:3, the Apostle close the description of the faith of Abraham which is confirmed in this section. *Hofmann* remarks to this: "In no way had Abraham's very own action made him that which God is for itself & became the father of the people of God, but his faith had done that, with which he, however, gave the glory to God, which man owes to Him, so that from this it explains itself, how it could be imputed to him for righteousness. ... He is the father of all believers by his faith, which constituted the essential fulfillment of duty over against God." Thus according to *Hofmann's* opinion, which is also shared by other modern theologians, faith justifies because it gives to God the glory which man owes to God as a creature, because it is the essential fulfillment of

duty over against God. If that were the meaning of the *lypelle*, then he would thereby again take back every-
 thing that he had previously taught regarding justification by grace, without the works of the Law, would tear down again with one stroke what he had previously built up. It is not for that reason, because faith is a fulfillment of an obligation, not because of his perfection or strength, but only for this reason is faith counted to man for righteousness, because he, as Paul had testified previously, holds himself simply & alone to the promise of God & takes grace, salvation & righteousness out of this promise. In the detailed description of faith from v. 17 on Paul had only announced & very significantly placed before our eyes that faith as the *medium* in v. 13, and even that which faith takes, takes from God out of the Word, is that which justifies man before God. Even that which is said of the strengthening of faith in v. 23 is to be understood in this sense, namely that the believer with always increasing confidence ever comforts himself in the promise of God & with that the righteousness, which is promised & imparted to him in the promise.

A fine summary of the doctrine of faith, which is contained in this section, v. 17-22, is given by Körner with the following words: *Dice hic: Primum, fidem non esse tantum notionem historicam, vel otiosam exaltationem, aut opinionem incertam, sed esse πρὸς ὁμοίαν, firmam persuasionem et plenum assensum, promissionem dei intuentem, apprehendentem et retinentem. Secundo, merito damnari eorum doctrinam, qui jubent etiam credentes de gratia Dei dubitare, et docent, eos certo scire non posse, num remissionem peccatorum sint consecuti. Tertio, fidem non requirere aie, temere cogitare et impedimenta, neque ea curare, nec quaerere, num sint impossibilia, an non, sed tantum mihi verbo promissionis, et ab eo totum sentire. Quarto, fidem in teo informam et languidam semini credere, nec acquirere et confirmari. Quinto, fidem tribuere gloriam dei, testimonium veritatis, misericordiae et omnipotentiae, et esse prosequium cultum, quem Deus requirat, et qui solus iis probetur, sitque in iis et alie plane ignotus. Postremo, dice fidei prosequium effectum esse, quod carumque et ardentem amorem promissa, et, quod maximum est, ea obtineatur promissa justitiae, remissio peccatorum et donatio vitae aeternae.*

4.23-25.

These last verses complete the discussion regarding Abraham, which has carried through the entire chapter. What is written concerning Abraham, namely, in the passages of Genesis quoted and expounded in this chapter, is not only written for the sake of Abraham, that his future generations might know information concerning him, that faith was counted to him for righteousness, *ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν*, and *τὸ πρὸς ὁμοίαν* *ἐστὶν* *ἡ πίστις ὅτι*, but also for our sakes, so that we might learn from Abraham's example how we are justified before God. This thought lies at the base of the entire preceding

amplification, but is here once again brought into prominence. Also to unshalt faith be wanted, for righteousness, $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \delta\omicron\gamma\iota\ \varsigma\epsilon\theta\omicron\alpha\iota$. That is God's ordinance & statement. The present $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$ designates the $\delta\omicron\gamma\iota\ \varsigma\epsilon\theta\omicron\alpha\iota$ as a fact which continues throughout the entire N. T. time. And now the Apostle designates exactly the object of this specific Christian N. T. faith. We Christians believe in the God who raised our Lord Jesus from the dead, in the Father of Jesus Christ, & with that also in Jesus Christ Himself. Paul mentions directly the resurrection of Christ from the dead in order to permit the Christian faith to appear similar to the faith of Abraham. Abraham already believed in the God who quickens the dead, v. 17, & we Christians believe in the God who has already proved this power of His, who has made alive again Jesus, who was crucified. Bongel: *Pictor Abrahami forebatur in id, quod futurum erat et fieri, posset, non tamen in id, quod factum est, ut raque in Virificatorems.* That corresponds in general to the difference between the Old & the New Testament. The O. T. devout believed in the future Christ; the N. T. devout believe in the Christ, who has now come & appeared in the flesh. The resurrection of Christ, however, is not for itself the content & object of the Christian faith, but in its connection with the death of Christ & of the effects of both inclusively. Thus it reads further, v. 25: $\delta\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \theta\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \varsigma\iota\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon\varsigma\ \varsigma\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \varsigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\beta\iota\upsilon\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon$. Christ has first of all been given into death, & certainly for the sake of our transgressions, in order to expiate & atone for them. And then He has been raised again, & certainly for the sake of our justification. Most modern commentators understand this last statement thus, that thru the resurrection of Christ the later working of faith & with that the justification, which is stipulated thru faith, has been made possible. This interpretation, however, contradicts the presentation of the Apostle in 1:2:21 ff., according to which the $\varsigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\beta\iota\upsilon\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon$ is once & for all times already presented in Christ & is offered to man as a prepared gift in the Gospel. And in our passage the $\varsigma\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \varsigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\beta\iota\upsilon\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon$ is evidently parallel to the $\varsigma\iota\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon$. As thru the death of Christ the atonement of our sins is worked directly, so our justification thru the resurrection of Christ. As in & with the death of Christ the atonement of our sins is established & given, so in & with the resurrection of Christ is our justification established & given. The purpose, in that it reads $\varsigma\iota\alpha\ \varsigma\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \varsigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\beta\iota\upsilon\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon$, is here, as often thought of, as the foundation. Therefore God has raised Christ from the dead, because even thereby He would justify us, & even this purpose is fulfilled with the resurrection. Our justification thus appears in our passage as an effect of the resurrection of Christ. Certainly the righteousness which avails before God is already presented & prepared thru the death, thru the bloody atonement of Christ, as we have proven a few above. In the sin of man really atoned for, made good before the eyes of God, annulled, then men thereby are *eo ipso* justified before God. But both, the atonement like the justification, which according to the case fall together, are then strengthened & sealed thru the resurrection of Christ. In that God has so, & even from the dead, He has actually declared that the death of Christ has fulfilled its purpose, that sin has

been expiated, that He has accepted the expiation, & so the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, this glorious victory over death & sin, is at the same time an actual, solemn & formal abolition, which God has spoken over and to mankind. The atonement for sin, as is the judgment of justification general, applies to the entire world of sinners. The Gospel, however, in that he writes $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\varsigma, \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\varsigma$, refers both especially to the believing Christians. For the believers think first of all on that, take comfort in that which God has done for them in Christ. That Jesus moreover is called "our Lord" in this connection is here as little as anywhere else an empty exhibition of names; thus His death & resurrection & their effect Christ is even our Lord & we have become His own. Likewise from the description presented here of the Christian faith & its object it becomes sufficiently evident why faith is counted to us for righteousness. Even therefore, because faith applies to itself Jesus Christ, the crucified & risen One, & with that His atonement & justification. The SIKAIW has happened & is explained, by that the Gospel testifies. That we believe, in that we comfort ourselves; whenever therefore believers draw this SIKAIW to his congregation. And so everyone who believes shall be regarded by God as justified.

Summary of the 4. Chapter: Abraham, the father of all believers, so far all believers, like Abraham, are justified alone by grace through faith & also receive the inheritance, so far all believers dwell in the faith of Abraham, who looked away entirely from his own power & held himself only to the promise of God.

Chapter V.

5, 1-11. The Blessed Results of Justification.

5, 1-5a.

In that with $\Delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\beta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\tau\epsilon\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\chi \epsilon\kappa \tau\acute{\iota}\beta\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ the Apostle resumes the closing thought of Chap. 4. $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\beta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\tau\epsilon\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\varsigma$, and in general points back to the entire preceding discussion, he now speaks of that which now, after we have been justified by faith, takes place in us & describes the blessed effects of justification. The first result is that we now have peace with God. The expressions $\epsilon\iota\eta\eta\epsilon\upsilon\eta$ $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\beta\epsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu$ does not designate the tranquillitas animi likewise not the pacis conscientia, but the peaceful relationship in which we stand to God, which certainly is reflected in the peace of conscience. Philippi remarks fittingly: "The discussion here is not, as in 5, 1 ff., of the lifting up of our $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ to God, but of the lifting up of the $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ of God to us. It is not the soothing, but the blessed effects of justification are now traced in 5, 1-11. In this entire chapter the Apostle still does not step out of the wonderful & comforting objective of the doctrine of atonement & justification, but leads us first of all by means of a development of their blessed

results still deeper into the knowledge of their essence." And we must admit that Chrysostom is right, when he continues: "Already out of this ground the reading, which is certainly supported by important but still not predominating witnesses, accepted by Lachmann, but rejected by most commentators, apparently arising from the ecclesiastical, parenthetical use of our passage: $\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, let us (thru withdrawing from sin, or by a God-pleasing life, or thereby, that we remain yielded faithfully to Christ) maintain peace with God, is to be designated as unsuitable & untenable. If our peace with God consists in the suspension of the divine wrath, then we cannot maintain peace, but God must maintain peace. Only the maintaining of faith, not the maintaining of peace belongs to man. However, the Epistle also cannot admonish to maintain peace, because he had still not spoken of the fact that we have peace. And even that we have peace is expressed by the indicative $\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$. Similarly Meyer: $\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$, according to HCDKLS in Minusc. u. m. Vers. (also for Vulg. St.) u. Väter. But this nevertheless a strongly attested reading according to the sense (let us maintain peace with God), is completely unsuitable here, since a new theoretical point of teaching begins, at whose head an admonition, & certainly with regard to a subject concerning which nothing had yet been spoken, would be a strange element. Therefore the equally strong enough attested $\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ is to be retained, & the conjunctive to be deduced from a misunderstanding or from the parenthetical use 'd. H.'. And Weiss: "Likewise the whole train of thought of the Letter would be destroyed thereby, if one would let the Epistle pass over to the section on an admonition here. All the following shows that the dogmatic exposition continues undisturbed & discriminates itself over the effects of the justification, so that also this first & foremost result is first expounded & thus cannot be made as a self-evident admonition to the opposite. ... In general the relationship of peace to God can only be presented from God's side, in that He declares man as well-pleasing to Him, & therefore shall not be admonished to holding of peace with God. Thus with that it remains, that the reading pericula iniquitatis, in which case also according to Theodoroz' in spite of the outward testimony it must be renounced, altho he will not concede that this case holds. The inner grounds here presented for the indicative $\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ are so evident & decided, that it is not worth the trouble to enter more closely upon the artful attempts, which Hofmann & Brard, Klostermann, each in his own way, have recently set up to justify the conjunctive positively."

Thru our Lord Jesus Christ the peace with God has been mediated to us, even thru Him, "durch welchen wir auch den Zugang gehabt haben durch den Klauen zu dieser Gnade, in der wir stehen" ("by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand"), $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ($\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta\tau\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\eta\tau\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\upsilon\eta\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\alpha$, $\omega\gamma\eta$ is here, as in Eph. 2, 13; 3, 12, to be taken in the intransitive sense & signifies "Zutritt", "admission", "Zugang", access. The grace, to which Paul here points, is the grace of justification. Thru Christ, thru the atoning death of Christ, this grace has been obtained for us, the access to the same opened up, & thru faith in

Christ, in that we have become believers, we have now entered into the grace & now stand in grace. The conclusion of the Christian is a conclusion of grace. We are justified from sin, our sins are forgiven us, so that God has nothing more against us, therefore nothing any longer lies in the midst between God and us.

A second effect of justification is that we now boast of the hope of the glory of God. v. 2b. The words $\kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha \epsilon\pi' \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \delta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \tau\omega\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ are not a continuation of the relative clause in v. 2b, but of the principle clause in v. 1b. With $\epsilon\pi'$, as otherwise with words of effect, the foundation and object of $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ is introduced. The hope appears here as a benefit in which the Christian rejoices and boasts, & that which he hopes for is the glory of God, that is, the glory which is God's own & which shall at one time also be imparted to him. Cp. Rom. 8, 18. Already in 1, 10 the apostle had pointed to the final goal of the righteousness of faith, the $\epsilon\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$. And in 4, 13 he had spoken of his future inheritance, which we receive in the same manner as righteousness, namely, out of grace through faith. Now, where he exhibits the sanctifying effects of the justification of faith, he stays longer with the vision into the glorious future, which has been opened up to the believing justified Christians. We Christians boast of the hope of the future glory, & not only that, but *wir rühmen uns auch der Trübsale* ("but we glory in tribulation also"). Thus we translate $\epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha \epsilon\pi' \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda\iota\psi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, v. 3, and not: *wir rühmen uns auch in den Trübsalen*. For there are not here two different situations, in which the Christian boasts of the hope, but two objects of praise set over against one another. $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha \epsilon\pi' \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, *sich eines Dinges rühmen*, is a usual manner of construction in the N. T. Cp. Rom. 2, 17; 5, 11; 1 Cor. 13, 13; Gal. 5, 13.

Now far we can boast of tribulation, which appears to stand in contradiction to the future glory, instilled by the following: *"indem wir wissen, dass die Trübsal Geduld wirkt, die Geduld aber Bewährung, die Bewährung aber Hoffnung"* ("knowing that tribulation worketh patience; & patience, experience; & experience, hope"). v. 3b. 4. Tribulation turns out only to our benefit. For in the manifold oppressions of this time faith is exercised & proven, faith becomes patience, endurance, steadfastness, $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\omicron\gamma\epsilon$, and in that faith overcomes all adverse things, it is established ($\epsilon\sigma\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$). In such a way, however, the hope is also strengthened & increased. In the darkness of suffering the hoped-for glory comes before the eyes of the established Christian more clearly & brightly. And the hope of the Christian does not permit one to come to shame, really, is not ashamed, $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, v. 5a. The hope would discern us, if it deceives us, if it remains unfulfilled. But that it does not do. *hinc erit res.* Bengel: *The present -*

($\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$) - expresses this thought more strongly than the future $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, to which Hofmann incorrectly gives the preference.

words: $\delta\tau\iota\ \eta\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\epsilon\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \hbar\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \hbar\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\$. So $\hbar\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \hbar\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. "Denn die Liebe Gottes ist ausgegossen in unsere Herzen durch den Heiligen Geist, der uns gegeben ist" ("because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us"). V. 5b. With $\eta\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, thru which the fulfillment of the Christian hope is guaranteed, is certainly not meant, as Hofmann would, our love to God. For concerning the love which we have to God & which first has risen in our hearts, it still cannot be said, that it is shed abroad in our hearts. What is shed abroad in our hearts must originally have its existence outside of us. And with the expression $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\epsilon\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \hbar\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \hbar\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, v. 8, "Gott aber bewiset seine Liebe gegen uns" ("God commendeth his love toward us"), is evidently the concept $\eta\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, v. 5, taken up again. Therefore with most commentators we take $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ as genitive of the subject & $\eta\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ as a designation of the love which God has to us. But this is not in the sense, as Hofmann would, as if God had thereby proven His love to us, that He had given us His Spirit & thru this same awakened us to a new, spiritual life. According to this interpretation, as also according to that of Hofmann, "würde der Apostel aus der in uns bereits vollbrachten Umwandlung auf die andere Umwandlung, die wir noch erhoffen, die Verklärung des Fleisches, aus der Heiligkeit des in uns gesetzten Lebens auf die dieser Heiligkeit entsprechende Herrlichkeit schließen." Such an argument, nevertheless, lies entirely outside of the context. According to 5, 1 the Apostle describes in the foregoing context the effects of the justification & also even presents our hope & the certainty of the hope as a result of justification, not as an effect of sanctification. And in the following, v. 6 ff., he calls special attention now to the objective proof of the love of God, that Christ has died for us. Concerning the love, which God entertains against us & which has proven itself in the death of Christ, it is thus predicated in v. 5b, that it is shed abroad in our hearts. It reads $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\epsilon\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\omega\upsilon\varsigma$. The Greek, as also the Latin, can consider wine poured out in a vessel, as well as also into a vessel. Cp. LXX, Ps. 45, 2: $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\chi\upsilon\tau\eta\ \chi\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. But what would this say, that the love of God, this affect, this disposition of God over against us had shed itself in our hearts, later explains strikingly with the words: quae caritatis effusio in nobis non quae in hac in passionem subjectivam, sed quae manifestationem et quae effectum vel sensum ejusdem in cordibus nostris effusam. And even this has taken place thru the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us. The Holy Spirit has been shed abroad over us richly, Tit. 3, 6; Gal. 3, 2, and the same certifies to us, very richly & powerfully, that God loves us, has loved us in Christ, gives us to experience the love of God inwardly, in our hearts. And because it is even the Spirit of God, who has given us to experience God's love, therefore we are entirely certain of the same, divinely certain. "Hence we see" - so Philippi concludes his explanation of v. 5 - that the Apostle, when he would also let the hope of eternal life be strengthened by constancy & confirmation in suffering, still considers this constancy & confirmation so little as a sufficient ground for his hope, that he much rather designates not our

love to God, which confirms itself thru constancy, but God's love to us, which renews Christ's atoning death, as the lasting & secure foundation of our hope for future glory."

In the sentence structure from v. 6 on, on which we have already reflected in part, in order to establish the meaning of $\eta \alpha \nu \alpha \nu \tau \omega \tau \omega \theta \epsilon \omega$, v. 5, there is now explained the closer thing, how far the love of God is a guarantee of our hope. First of all, we must here consider how the words immediately following are to be read. According to the lectio recepta the text of v. 6 reads: $\epsilon \tau \iota \gamma \alpha \rho \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \tau \omega \varsigma \theta \nu \tau \omega \nu \eta \mu \omega \nu \alpha \theta \epsilon \omega \nu \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \omega \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \epsilon \beta \omega \nu \kappa \tau \epsilon \epsilon \chi \alpha \nu \epsilon$. The $\epsilon \tau \iota$ after $\alpha \theta \epsilon \omega \nu$ is found in $\Delta \text{ABCDEF G}$, is thus so strongly attested, that we must maintain it unconditionally. Also the $\epsilon \tau \iota$ at the head of the sentence has important witnesses for it: $\Delta \text{ACDEK P. Minn., Mre., Brem., Br., Apr.}$, but it appears as inconvenient. The second $\epsilon \tau \iota$ is easily understandable: "da wir doch schwach waren" ("when we were yet without strength"). On the other hand, the first $\epsilon \tau \iota$ is hardly conceivable. When one draws that which lies the closest to the principle clause, then one must exert every art and ingenuity to gain a tolerable meaning for the sentence: "Christus ist noch hier die Hottensen erstorben" ("Christ died for the ungodly"). Therefore several commentators, who contend for the double $\epsilon \tau \iota$, combine also this first $\epsilon \tau \iota$, in the same manner as the second, with the participial modifier.

Similar hyperbaton with adverbs, also with $\epsilon \tau \iota$, are not unusual in Greek. Cf. Winers, *gram.* 61.4. Nevertheless there is no real reason why $\theta \nu \tau \omega \nu \eta \mu \omega \nu \alpha \theta \epsilon \omega \nu$ should be modified by a double $\epsilon \tau \iota$. For that reason one is strongly tempted in this case to erase the second $\epsilon \tau \iota$, as many critics have dared to do in spite of its strong attestation. In view of these difficulties it appears so much more necessary to test sufficiently the more weakly attested readings. Certainly the $\epsilon \iota \gamma \alpha \rho$ in F G and in one of the corrections of Codex L, for which Kostermann energetically intercedes, absolutely does not fit into the context. Such a question, "To what purpose has Christ then died for the ungodly?", whose answer the reader himself must supply, would contrast with the peaceful, symmetrical form of presentation of the preceding passage & run contrary to the entire argument of the Epistle; for he here operates with the fact that Christ has died for the sinners, for the ungodly, not with the purpose of this fact. "A question regarding the purpose of the divine love would not be in place in this entire amplification of proof, since it does not treat here of the purpose, but of the special character of this love." Hodel. On the other hand, the reading $\epsilon \iota \gamma \alpha \rho$, contained in the version, *Sind, Aug., and Beza*, for which also the $\epsilon \tau \iota \gamma \epsilon$ of the Vaticanus speaks & for which Schott, Elbrach, & Luthardt have decided, deserves

all consideration. A copyist, who missed the apodosis in the conditional clause beginning with $\epsilon \iota \gamma \alpha \rho$ and read $\epsilon \tau \iota$ twice in the following parts, v. 6.8, might well have produced a third $\epsilon \tau \iota$ out of the $\epsilon \iota$. And it is easier explainable that $\epsilon \iota \gamma \alpha \rho$ than that $\epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \gamma \alpha \rho$ would be changed into an $\epsilon \tau \iota \gamma \alpha \rho$. Above all, however, the reading $\epsilon \iota \gamma \alpha \rho$ at the head of the sentence structure which begins with v. 6 is recommended by strong inner grounds. It is a construction which is beloved by Paul, that he clothes

176.
55b-11.

a firmly established fact, which has somewhat been confirmed already previously, in the form of a condition, in order to infer another fact from that. In our passage the following sentence structure is submitted: Then if Christ has died for the ungodly, & God has even thereby proved His incomparable, as this is actually the case, vv. 6-8, thus it follows that we are now so much the more saved from His future wrath, v. 9. The $\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\ \mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ in v. 9 then introduces the apodosis & the $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ explains itself from the amplification of the protasis. The entire statement in vv. 6-9 is then, however, a modifier & vindication of the statement contained in v. 5, that the love of God guarantees the fulfillment of our hope for the future glory. One still takes in addition the fact that this same construction is repeated three times in this chapter: vv. 10, 11: $\text{Εἰ γὰρ ἔχθροι ὄντες, ἐτι - πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαχέσθης, ἐτι;}$ v. 15: $\text{εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παρὰ πταίματι, ἐτι - πολλῷ μᾶλλον ᾗ ἡμῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐτι.}$ v. 17: $\text{εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παρὰ πταίματι, ἐτι - πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τῶν περὶ ἡμῶν εἰς αὐτὸν, ἐτι.}$ What could make one see again finally in the presented interpretation of vv. 6-9, is solely the circumstance that εἰ γὰρ is more strongly attracted than εἰ γὰρ . Then one must here lay more weight upon the inner testimony than upon the outer. Moreover the sense of the discourse remains essentially unchanged, when one firmly holds to the double εἰτι . Only that then in place of the involved grammatical conclusion there follows a loose train of thought. The passage, vv. 6-8, in the latter case would be an interpretation of the concept ᾗ ἡμῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ in v. 5, and in v. 9 the future deliverance from wrath would be inferred in an independent statement from the love of God, which manifests itself in the death of Christ.

Now we would look more closely at the individual expressions contained in the section, vv. 6-9. That is then the proof of the love of God, which the Epistle already had in mind in v. 5b, concerning which the discourse had been repeated in the section beginning in 3:1, that Christ has died for us, for the ungodly, $\text{ὃς ἡμῶν ἁπλῶς ἔθαυε}$ v. 6. The ὃς ἡμῶν , which in similar connections where the suffering & death of Christ is spoken of, often signifies "anastati", instead of, in place of, e.g., 1 Pet. 3:18, we take, corresponding to the ὃς ἡμῶν εἰς ἡμῶν and ὃς ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ , v. 7, in the general sense, "zu Gunsten", in favor of, on behalf of, "zum Besten", for the benefit of. Out of love to us, for our benefit, in order to redeem us, Christ has given Himself, has deposited His own life. To be sure, His death, when one looks at the facts, has come only for our benefit, since He has died in our place. The love & favor of Christ appears so much the greater, comes into the correct light first, when one takes the fact that "wir noch schwach waren" ("we were yet without strength"), when Christ died, $\text{ὅτι ἡμῶν ἁπλῶς ἔθαυε}$. The expression ὅτι ἡμῶν does not point, as some have frequently taken it, to the wretched, helpless condition, in which we found ourselves previously, which the helping love of God had called forth, since our weakness is much rather stand in contrast to the death of Christ, but designates, as the parallel expressions εἰς ἡμῶν and ὃς ἡμῶν in v. 7 prove, the moral quality, the moral unworthiness, the moral impotence of the persons for whom the sacrifice of Christ avails. We were sinful, ungodly, weak, entirely incapable of all good, which would say that we stood as

sinful, ungodly men before God, could produce nothing, could make nothing good before God, which would have directed God's good pleasure to us. For that the Apostle here favors, former relationship to God before his eyes, appears from the contrast $\Sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\beta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\nu\upsilon\upsilon$, v. 9. In that he writes $\epsilon\pi\omega\upsilon\varsigma$, the Apostle includes himself with his Christian readers, in general with his Christian contemporaries; he speaks here, as well as in the entire section, in the name of all those who have been justified by faith. He distinguishes two states in the life of the Christians of that time, the first, when they were still weak, the second, when they had been justified by the death of Christ. Still he does not have his contemporaries in mind exclusively. At the same time, in that he introduces the expression $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$, $\epsilon\iota$ instead of the $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\upsilon\omega\upsilon\varsigma$, and thus makes it manifest that Christ has died for the ungodly in general, he points to the two great periods of the world, the period before Christ & the Christian period, which he here dates, from the death of Christ, & characterizes the first as a time of weakness & sin, of general godlessness, the latter as a time when Christ & the righteousness in Christ which avail before God have been manifested to the children of men. He there judges *a priori* and deducts, from that that the death of Christ has also retrospective power & that also before Christ there were righteous ones, who like Abraham & David, had been justified by faith, as well as also of the fact that since Christ has come & died, sin & godlessness are to be found

on the earth. The difference of time for him, however, finally falls together with difference of the situation, with the contrast between the condition of things outside of Christ & the Christian condition. So we, whose life falls in the N. E. era, can still speak similarly today, as the Apostle speaks here, that, when we were still weak, the death of Christ has come for our benefit. We are all together by nature & birth weak, sinful, ungodly, but now in consequence of the salutary effect of the death of Christ we have passed from the condition of sin into the condition of righteousness. And now the Apostle emphasizes that, when we were still, $\epsilon\tau\iota$, weak, Christ has died for the ungodly, whom He found as such, that Christ's death, love, & favor enter into this condition of weakness, sin & godlessness, that the moral unworthiness of man was learned and alleviated by nothing, until Christ entered in with His sacrifice for them, in that man had done nothing and could have done nothing which might have given him a better appearance before God.

To the statement of the c. verse, however, there is still added the modifier $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma$. The part of the commentators refers this to the preceding. Frische combines $\epsilon\tau\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma$ in the sense of *ad hoc eo tempore*, *ad hoc*, "noch zu der Zeit, da wir schwach waren". But then $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma$ is a very disengaged addition. Even so, when one with Luther & ancient commentators refers these words to the entire part

) principal clause & translates: "da wir noch schwach waren noch zu der Zeit." A more distorted thought, on the other hand, comes forth, when others, like Schott, Weiss & Ehard, translate: "da wir noch schwach waren zu Folge der Zeit", in that the time brings with itself such weakness. For the evil time has not made men evil, but ungodly men had made the time before Christ into a time of general ungodliness. With most exegeses, therefore, we combine $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma$ with the following, with the principle clause: $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ — $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$

178.
5,52-11.

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ. However, not in the sense, as Hofmann & Klostermann would, that Christ has died only with regard to the time, not in general for the ungodly, which should say, that He has died in a time of general godlessness. For Christ has died simply & exclusively for the ungodly, since all men are & were by nature ungodly. Even so little can we agree in opinion with Meyer, who would permit the Apostle to say Christ has still died at the right time for the ungodly, namely, for the generations of that time, before they died in their godlessness. That leads to the strange thought, as if Christ's redemption benefited only this contemporary generation. We take the expression κατὰ καιρὸν in our passage, even as in John 4, with Brunn, Bengel, Schieritz, De Wette, Burkert, Tholuck, Philipp, Rodet & Hodge in the meaning tempore statuto, & understand the apostolic expression thus, that Christ has died for the ungodly at the time determined by God. Loosely the expositors named point to such parallels as Gal. 4, 4; 1 Tim. 2, 6; Tit. 1, 2, where it is said that God has sent His Son at the fulness of time, οὐκ ἐν πληρώσει τοῦ χρόνου, that Christ, κατὰ καιρὸν, at one time has given Himself as a ransom for all, that God κατὰ καιρὸν has revealed His Word. It is also not so difficult to understand why Paul has called special attention to this point in this place. Even such a time, as is described in the context of our passage, as it is described already in the first chapter of our Letter, had occasioned it the carrying out of His curse of redemption. Even at the time, when the godlessness had increased to the uttermost, when the sickness of man had reached its greatest crisis, the doctor should appear & bring healing to the sick unto death. This serves only in majorum dei, gratiae divinae gloriam. Gregory of Nyssa remarks on Rom. 5, 6: dei animarum aegrotantium medicinae expectant, dum malitiae moritur, quae naturae benignum vincta laborabat, ne tutum egeret, ne latens aliquid incuratum remaneret, si curaret id solum quod cerneretur. And Theophylact: ἐπεὶ πάντες ἄνθρωποι κακίαι, διεξέχοντο ὡς φθορὰς ὡς ἀνθρώπων πλὴν ἐδείξατο θεοπροφητείας, ἵνα πᾶσι τοῖς ἁμαρτωίοις ὁ θεός.

is that that has to mean, that Christ, when we were still without strength, has died for the ungodly, what kind of love this is, the Lyotle explains & illustrates in v. 7. by a comparison of this love with human love. It reads in v. 7a: $\omega\delta\iota\varsigma\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \epsilon\upsilon\eta\epsilon\rho\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\pi\omicron\beta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. Then it stands among men, that one would hardly die for a righteous one. The contrast to $\epsilon\upsilon\eta\epsilon\rho\ \alpha\epsilon\beta\omega\iota\varsigma$ in v. 6 & the lack of the article demands that one takes $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$ as masculine and this statement is confirmed by the following: $\epsilon\upsilon\eta\epsilon\rho\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\beta\omega\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \iota\omicron\upsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\eta\mu\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\beta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\upsilon$. v. 7b. One sees herein in many ways a confirmation ex contrario. One takes $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\beta\omega\iota$ also as a masculine, places a difference between a $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and an $\alpha\gamma\alpha\beta\omega\iota\varsigma$, in that one places the latter much higher, further makes an excessive difference between $\omega\delta\iota\varsigma$ and $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon$ and lets the Lyotle say somewhat the following: Hardly does one die for a righteous one, altho that is not altogether excluded; for if turned around it treats of a good one, then it happens much easier & sooner, that one offers his life for this one. The difference between a righteous & a good one men have designated very differently: a $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is supposed to be one who has done nothing to harm anyone, an $\alpha\gamma\alpha\beta\omega\iota\varsigma$ one who positively does the good; or a $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ the simple

righteous one, an ἀγαθός; the one who combines high-mindedness with righteousness; or a δίκαιός is one who does every thing that the Law demands & whose character offers respect, an ἀγαθός; one whose action is guided by love & inspires love; or a δίκαιός, the righteous one, who in regard to a special reproach is acknowledged as innocent, an ἀγαθός, the good one, who in all factors is unblamable; or a δίκαιός, an upright man, an ἀγαθός, a noble man, a bes character, a father patrias. The great variety & diversity of these definitions already shown sufficiently the untenableness of such distinctions. In fact one as well as in biblical Greek δίκαιός and ἀγαθός are used as synonyms & are used promiscuously. U. Mat. 5:45: "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil & on the good (ἀγαθός), & sendeth rain on the just (δίκαιους) & on the unjust." Luke 23:50: ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθός καὶ δίκαιος. Gen. 7:12: ἔκλυται ὁ ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος καὶ ἀγαθός. Further this strange in the setting existing in the discussion that ἀγαθός has the article & that a double contrast is given for ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀγαθός v. his fitting difference between δίκαιος and τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, and one difference we must establish, if we would not attribute a tautology to the Apostle, we gain only this, when we, for which the article also speaks, with Luther, Melancthon, Rückert, Rodet, Hofmann, Otto, Weiss & Petherell, take τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ as a neuter & translate: "Denn um der willen willens unternimmt es vielleicht Einer wirkliches unterben." The good thing in them the general category, in which also as δίκαιός belongs. And this statement is then foundation of the possibility, which is introduced with ὁ ἀνθρωπος, that one still in the end dies for a righteous one. The meaning & thought connection of the Epistle is accordingly the following: Among men it stands thus, that one somewhat really undertakes, brings oneself (καὶ τόλμα) to die for the good thing, that one pledges his life for that which has real worth, moral worth, in order not to permit this worthwhile thing to come to ruin. And thus it also really happens, even though not easily & not often, that one dies for a righteous one, in consideration of the good that is found in him. Thus in v. 6 the ungodly are simply contrasted to the righteous one, who can show some good. Self-evidently Paul speaks here only of that which is righteous, good, lovely in the natural sphere, speaks here only of the justitia civilis in which before the eyes of God man remains that which he is by nature, an ἀγαθός.

Thus far human love brings it; & certainly only in the favorable case, in infrequent exceptional cases. Entirely otherwise, on the other hand, does it conduct itself with the love of God, whose characteristic the Epistle had already shown in v. 5b. 6, and once again brings into prominence: οὐκ ἔστιν ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἔσθῃ. ὅτι ἔτι ἀπαρτῶμεν ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν! ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἡμῶν ἀνέβηκε. V. 7. "Beh.

aber kommt seine Liebe gegen uns, dass Christus, der unser höchster Vater war, für uns gestorben ist" ("But God commended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us"). God proves his love to us in that which Christ has done. God & Christ stand on one step. It is even the love of God in Christ, which Paul here promises. The present οὐκ ἔστιν explains itself in the fact that the salutary effect of the death of Christ continues throughout all times. The simple ὅτι is a shortened manner of speech

for $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$, $\delta\tau\iota$. The emphasis here also lies on the fact that Christ has died for us, when we were still sinners, when we had improved in no degree, that God has given His Son, that Christ has given Himself into death for such people who were thoroughly sinful & evil, possessed no moral worth, were worthy of no love, with whom likewise nothing was lost, if they had been lost. That is the unique, incomparable love of God, which surpasses all thought, far, far exceeds all human demonstrations & thoughts of love.

And from these facts, that God has loved us so ardently that Christ has died for us sinners, the Apostle now draws the conclusion: $\pi\omicron\iota\lambda\eta\ \sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\ \mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu - \sigma\omega\theta\eta\epsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ $\delta\iota\ \lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\tau\iota\omicron\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \theta\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\varsigma$ V. 9. This conclusion is, as already remarked above, also a long grammatical conclusion, if we take V. 9 as an apodosis to a protasis beginning with $\epsilon\iota$. $\gamma\alpha\rho$ in 11. 6. & because that is so, as has been shown previously, then we shall now also so much the more, that means, so much the rather, multo potius, be saved so much more certainly thru Him, thru Christ, from the wrath, really off from the wrath, so that we remain preserved from the wrath, which on that day shall come upon all godless men, who have remained godless even unto the end. Into this statement which brings the conclusion the Apostle, however, adds the parenthesis $\delta\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \nu\upsilon\nu\ \epsilon\iota\ \tau\omega\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and thereby recapitulates the premise contained in vv. 5-8, out of which he concludes the future deliverance, in order to make this conclusion so much the more evident. The content of this participial clause evidently coincides with the content of the preceding verse. The expression $\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omega\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ points back to the mention of the death of Christ, characterizes the same as a violent, bloody death & thereby lets the sacrifice of the love of God appear so much greater. And $\delta\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \nu\upsilon\nu$ explains how far the death of Christ has come for our benefit. Thru Christ's death & blood we have been justified. The $\delta\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\iota$ also presents itself here as the immediate effect of the death of Christ, which God already being established & given with the death of Christ itself. This proves out of the context of our passage also the $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ V. 10, which is parallel & synonymous to $\delta\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. Christ has died for all godless men, has justified them all thru His death. But the believing Christians are even those who have made this benefit of Christ their own, & who turn this to their advantage continually, draw profit from it, from it draw the conclusion & speak & acknowledge with the Apostle: Thus we are now justified, & after we have been justified, we also have been saved from the wrath. This conclusion of faith, to which the Apostle leads, is, as one is accustomed to say & as most expositors remark, a conclusion as majori, ad minus. The greater thing has happened, therefore the lesser shall certainly not be omitted. That is the greatest benefit of God, the principle proof of the love of God, that Christ has died for the godless, that Christ has shed His blood for us, & of this love we are assured thru the Spirit of God; therefore we do not need to doubt, that we shall also experience on that day not wrath, but love from God. We were formerly ungodly, but now we have been justified thru Christ's death & blood, have become righteous ones out of ungodly ones & are thus now justified before God, completely justified, completely so, as God would have us: therefore

we do not have to fear, that on that day God's wrath & displeasure shall befall us. The change & progress, that out of godless ones righteous ones have come, is greater than the other, that out of justified men there come saved men. And so the first change guarantees the latter. Through Christ we are saved from wrath. Christ, who shall return on that day & fulfill God's judgment on the world, shall certainly intercede for them & preserve them against the wrath, on whom He has turned His heart's blood, whom He has made clean & righteous thru His blood.

The conclusion is repeated in v. 10, only with other words, which permit the certainty of the same to stand out so much more significantly: $\text{ὅτι ὅτι ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον κατελλάγημεν ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ}$. "Wenn wir nun wider, den wir Feinde waren, Gott durch den Tod seines Sohnes, wie viel mehr werden wir, nachdem wir reichlich sünd, gerettet werden in sein Leben" ("For, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life"). The ὅτι at the head of this statement marks the same as an explanation of the preceding. The hostile operation here with the contrast between the former relationship of enemies & the present relationship of reconciliation. Bauer, Dech, & Kutschke take ἐχθροὶ actively, concerning our enmity over against God, and κατηλλάγημεν and κατελλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ

subjectively, concerning the change of men which has been called for by the death of Christ, by the love of God, as a result of which we are now well-disposed toward God. "This interpretation, however," as Weiss correctly remarks, "contradicts the entire context, which does not treat of a change of the human disposition over against God, but of justification & its results, & would attribute to πολλῶ μᾶλλον an entirely different motive than in v. 9, where it concludes not concerning the greater worthiness of man in himself, but concerning the greater proof of love, which we already experience, for which we still hope." ἐχθροὶ is also found in a passive meaning. Cp. Rom. 11:26: $\text{κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροὶ εἰς ζωὴν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος}$. And κατελλάγημεν designates also, & even where the discussion is concerning a salutary act of God, the change of the disposition of God. Cp. 11 Cor. 5:19, where $\text{ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον κατελλάγων. αὐτῷ}$ is explained by the following modifiers $\text{μὴ λόγῳ ὁρμηνος αὐτοῖς, τὰ παλαιώματα αὐτῶν}$. In our passage this latter meaning for κατηλλάγημεν , looking away from the context, is put out of question by the parallel expression $\text{δι' οὗ τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβεμεν}$ in v. 11, which characterizes the reconciliation as a gift of God to men. Thus with most of the expositors, ancient & modern, we understand that which Paul says here concerning the reconciliation of

the enemy, to speak with Hofmann, concerning a "restoration into a relationship to God, wherein we no longer have Him against us, & not a restoration into an opposition, wherein we are no longer against Him." For this the modifiers of κατελλάγημεν also speak: $\text{διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ}$. For this raises the idea that our reconciliation is worked immediately thru the death of Christ, has happened & is completed in & with Christ's death. Before the death of Christ we owe our reconciliation. Christ is here ex-

182.
5, 5b-11.

precisely named God's Son. The divinity of Christ lies in the balance scales & gives to the death of Christ its incomparable, ~~unending~~ unending worth. The death of the Son of God suffices to still the wrath of the highest God, to move God to give up His enmity against sinful men, who are hateful to Him. Also in our passage it is called to our attention that the blessing of Christ enters in even in the opposing condition of man. Even when we were enemies, when we had God against us without this relationship of enmity having been lessened & modified in any degree, there entered in this great & wonderful change, then God's Son entered in for us, took wrath & enmity upon Himself, expiated the wrath through suffering & death, & thus changed our relationship of enmity to God into a relationship of friendship, turned to us God's grace & pleasure. And now the conclusion: If we, when we were still enemies, were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, as this is really the case, then now, after we have been reconciled, shall we be saved so much the more & more easily. Thus the believing Christians conclude, who have rightly known & applied to themselves the blessing of Christ, the reconciliation which has taken place through Christ. Weiss: "Τὸ νῦν πάλιν νῦν rests on the still very evident supposition that it is harder to do something good for the enemy than for the friend, that the reconciliation with that by one's very own advancing to meet is more difficult than the benefit in him, after he is reconciled to us." If the harder thing has happened, then surely the easier thing will result! The change of the hostility of God into the friendship of God, this great & important course of things, guarantees the latter change, which we still await. This latter thing change is also here portrayed as a being saved, σωθῆναι εἰς. Ek this, however, in our verse modified by ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. Most frequently they translate this: "durch sein Leben," & explain this translation in different ways. Meyer, Hofmann & others take "durch sein Leben" as identical with "durch den lebendigen Christus." The living Christ shall on that day maintain His own against His wrath. Together with the contrast between ἐχθροὶ and κατὰ λόγον εἰς εἰς they still state another, between εἰς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ and ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ, and suppose that also with reference to its mediation the future deliverance is the easier & more simple in comparison with the already happened reconciliation; in order to bring about the latter, the sacrifice of the life of Christ was necessary, for our future deliverance only the application of life is necessary, in which He now stands. Nevertheless "durch sein Leben" would still be a unique designation of the living Christ. And one also does not perceive why Paul had not also written here κατὰ τῆς ἐφ' ἧς, which one must still supply. Very correctly, in our opinion, Weiss points to another antithesis, that of κατὰ τῆς ἐφ' ἧς, v. 10a, and ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ, v. 11b. One can also very well translate: wir werden gerettet werden in sein Leben. With the verb ~~of motion~~ which emphasizing motion the terminus of the motion is often introduced with ἐν instead of εἰς. (cf. ἐκ κείνου εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. v. 5. The meaning of the hypostyle would then be: We shall be saved from the wrath into the life of Christ, so that we then stand in the life of Christ, "in the life of the glory of God" (Weiss). That is a thought which is very proper in the context of our passage. One expects here, where Paul would more firmly establish the fulfillment of our Christian hope, which reaches toward the glory of God.

& confirms this thru certain conclusions, also some mention of the positive side of our hope, that would then, more precisely, read thus: As accordingly as we are reconciled to God by the death of the Son of God, brought closer to God, then we shall also certainly one day live & dwell as reconciled children with Christ together with God, in the heavenly home of the Father. A definite reference of the ἐν τῷ Σαῶν αὐτοῦ to the Σὺν τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, is also not excluded in this case, as we have now become partakers of the fruit of the death of Christ, the reconciliation with God, so shall we one day share in the life of Christ, in the blessed life of glory.

But the Apostle is still not entirely at an end with this conclusion of his. He still adds the words: οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καὶ ὡς ἔμενον ἐν τῷ Θεῷ Σὺν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν. V. 11. The participle καὶ ὡς ἔμενον ἐν τῷ Θεῷ cannot possibly stand in the place of a *verbum finitum*, likewise it does not adopt itself as a modifier to σωθῆναι, but is to be coordinated with the καταλλαγὴν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ in V. 10, thus belongs to the promise, out of which the future salvation is concluded. We are saved, are translated into the life of Christ, after we have been reconciled to God, but not only that, but we also have been reconciled so, that we now rejoice in God. There is a difference between reconciliation & reconciliation. Among men it stands so, that one who had an enemy?

Has then been reconciled to him one, often still does not treat his former enemy, but keeps himself far from him, in order not to provoke him further, in order to avoid a new outbreak of his wrath. He is somewhat content, when the reconciled enemy only lets him in peace, henceforth causes him no injury, & expects & asks absolutely nothing of him, that he should do him good. Very differently is it with the reconciliation of God. It is a perfect, true reconciliation, the warmest friendship. It brings with itself, that we now also rejoice & glory in our God. Whoever is reconciled to God thru Christ holds it as completely excluded that he is at daggers again with God; he takes pleasure in his God, has unconditional confidence in God, & expects real good from God. Luther's comment on Rom. 5, 11: "We rejoice in God, that He is our God & we are His, & have all blessings in common of Him & with Him in all confidence." Such joy & confidence certainly does not hold firm when we look to ourselves & therein consider how we provoke God with our daily sins. But we rejoice even in God thru our Lord Jesus Christ, thru whom the reconciliation has been imparted to us, who has atoned & paid for all the sins of our lives by His death. If it now stands thus between ourselves & God, that we have not simply been reconciled with Him, but that we also rejoice & glory in Him as our God, how then can we still doubt that we also on that day shall receive nothing else but real good from Him, that He shall one day give us a share in the blessings of His house, in the joys of eternal life? We can really be completely certain of our eternal salvation.

The Apostle has proven what he wanted to prove, namely, that our hope does not make us ashamed. And such certain hope of salvation belongs to the effects of justification. What St. Paul says in the

184.
5, 5b-11.

discussed section concerning the relationship between justification & the future & so it is instructive & like everything that hangs together with the article of justification is highly comforting. Many times we Christians think too little of our present possession & suppose that we have been justified thru Christ, have received reconciliation thru Him, that we are only on the first step along the way to salvation, that the final goal still lies far in the distance. The passage out of time into eternity is the real deciding step, that is the punctum criticum, how we shall stand on that day before God. But no, it is not so. The greatest & the most important thing has already taken place. The deciding step, the punctum criticum lies behind us, the crisis is already overcome. We are reconciled to God thru Christ's death. We are just & good before God thru Christ. Our account with God is set right. And with that our eternal fate is already decided. Eternal salvation is the necessary, at the same time very self-evident consequence of our justification. The distance between sin & righteousness is far, far greater than the distance between righteousness & salvation, & we are already over the greatest, deepest gulf. Out of the status peccati we have entered into the status gratiae, and thus it is only a small & easy thing that we pass out of the status gratiae over into the status gloriae. That is the essential thing, the greatest point, that we are innocent with God, have God for us; the other is the lesser essential, whether we rejoice & glory in our God here in this weak tabernacle of the body, under the tribulations of this time, or there in the blessed life of glory. But even also this latter is not excluded, because the principle factor is decided. Certainly we would gladly be blessed. We yearn for the glory of God. But this is even the right way to the goal, not that we look out into the future, but that we absorb ourselves with all senses & thoughts in the present grace, in the grace of justification. The more firmly we take root there, just so much nearer are we to heaven. These are salutary thoughts, which the preceding demonstration of the Apostle, especially the νόμις, ἀνάλογος, evokes in us.

Finally there is still a misunderstanding to be disproved, to which the preceding conclusions of the Apostle could give occasion. That Paul here explains so strongly dialectically, so strongly concludes & infers, discloses the future salvation out of justification, gives no other teacher of Christianity a right now ex aequo to set up similar conclusions, out of one doctrine, which he gives in the Scriptures, to draw another doctrine, & even if the conclusion were even so plausible. The true theology is a theology of the Scriptures & goes not as hair's breadth over the thoughts, which the Scriptures present to it in clear words. The conclusions with which we have engaged ourselves are — that we may never dare forget — conclusions of the Apostle, & he has also here written, concluded, & inferred, having been moved by the Holy Ghost. These conclusions are constituent parts of the Scriptures & for that very reason are also binding for us. And when the Apostle, as he does herein Rom. 5, 6-7, places such conclusions in the mouth of the Christians, teaches & calls upon the Christians to conclude and infer there, then it belongs to the obedience of faith that we make these words & deductions of the Apostle, of the Scriptures, our own, so that we repeat that which the Holy Ghost has told us.

Summary of the section, 5, 1-11. The Apostle describes the blessed effects of justification, which are necessary

185.
5/12-14.

with God & the certainty of the future glory, which is guaranteed to us by God's love, Christ's death, and our justification & reconciliation.

5/12-21. The first and the second Adam.

5/12-14.

There follows, in vv. 12-21, a long extended statement of comparison & contrast related between Adam & Christ, in which the salvation which we owe to Christ is contrasted to the harm which we have inherited from Adam & is thus illustrated by the contrast. Some expositors, like Keese, Unrein, Kober & Lange, join this portion very closely with the immediate preceding, suppose that with 5:6 ff., v. 12, the second half of the comparison is introduced, & supply the first half out of the words of the 11. verse, resp. the 1a & 1b verse, in the sense: "Therefore we have now received reconciliation thru Christ the same as thru Adam the sin and thru sin death has come into the world; or: "Therefore we shall be saved thru Christ the same as we have thru Adam inherited sin & thereby death; or more generally: "Therefore it is with Christ as with Adam, etc. But still it is obvious that a new section begins with 5:6 ff. in v. 12, & that the discussion

is first of all concerning Adam & then in the second place concerning Christ. The question, to what does the 5:6 ff. refer back, and, how is the connection of the passage to the preceding presentation of the apostle to be taken, we shall not be able to answer, when we have previously brought the content of the same closer to our understanding. The other question, however, where this section is introduced with 5:6 ff. finds its apodosis in the following, and, whether an apodosis is present at all, or not much rather an Havar-Tatō 5:6 ff. lies here, shall answer itself in the course of the discussion.

Αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὡς πρὸς τὸν ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ὃ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου· ἐκ τούτου καὶ ὁ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ὁ ἔκδοτος — "Warum gleichwie durch einen Menschen die Sünde in die Welt hineingekommen ist und durch die Sünde der Tod" ("Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, & death by sin") — thus the new section begins. Sin & death are the two subjects of which Paul first of all treats & which he repeatedly names in the first half of the comparison, vv. 12-14. The word ἀμαρτία designates, even as the Hebrew חַטָּאת, "a failing conduct, however many it is, so that thereby there is mentioned the failure of the goal which is agreeable to God & designated by Him, in that the human conduct misses its destination & thereby His will of God" (Cramer), or: "Failure of the God-willed goal, deviation from the God-pleasing things, fulfillment of the things

— (1) "to which God is averse" (Delitzsch), or: "Every action conflicting with the holy will of God, no matter whether coming forth inwardly or outwardly" (Hopmann). The substantive ἀμαρτία is used in a double manner, abstractly & concretely, as Cramer expresses himself: one time as a conception of a species, thus nominally in the Pauline writings, the other time as single individual actions, as far as the noun ἀμαρτία also approaches the single example, the general concept is applied to the specific case, or, as Grimm distin-

186.
512-14.

quiescent: one time in the sense of τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν, peccatus, peccatio, the other time in the sense of id est, quod peccatur, peccatum, delictum, cogitatum vel factum divinae legis contrarium. For the first meaning both lexicographers introduce Rom. 5, 12 in the first line as an evidence. And concerning sin it is now said in our passage that it has entered into the world. Κόσμος designates here not the universe, but, as often, the world of men or the earth, which God had designed & prepared for the children of men. The thought that the evil had entered into the sublunar world out of the spirit world where it had previously existed, which is certainly correct in itself, lies entirely outside of the content. In this entire section Paul has before his eyes only that which has happened on earth, the history, conduct & destiny of man. What there is concerning sin, the figure of predication in the second part of the sentence also concerning death, however, with regard to death he expressly distinguishes the εἰς ὅν θείν εἰς τὸν κόσμον from the εἰς ὅν θείν εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. Thus with the εἰς ὅν θείν, the entering of sin into the world, it also cannot be meant, as some have frequently taken it, that sin affects the entire world of men, has spread itself over all mankind. With εἰς ὅν θείν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, there is described in Heb. 10, 5; 1 Tim. 1, 15, the entrance of Christ into the world, & in 11 John 7 the appearance of the living spirits, of the saints, Christ. And when now in our place the same predicate is attached to sin as to death, or when it reads in Gal. 2, 23: πρὸ τοῦ εἰσεῖν πίστιν, then thereby sin, even as death, & also faith are personified, & the meaning is that sin, death & faith have entered into the world, have made their appearance on earth, which would say, have begun to exist. Fritzsch remarks fittingly: εἰς ὅν θείν εἰς τὸν κόσμον nihil minus esse incipere nakt. In locutione εἰς ὅν θείν εἰς τὸν κόσμον plerumque hoc unum cogitatur: aliquid esse coepisse, quod antea non fuisset. ... Intrat homo in mundum, quum nascitur, nec, ubi aut rim suam primum exeret, ut εὐάνατος, aut primum committitur, ut facinus. In Rom. 5, 14 it is said of the idol: "Thou the rain honor of men have they come into the world, & therefore it was imagined that men are of a short life." With these words the beginning & origin of the idol of idol worship were characterized. That the idols "have come into the world" falls together with the fact that they are imagined by men. And thus the statement that sin has come into the world signifies nothing else than that it has taken its beginning on earth. At first sin was not in the world, but then a change entered in, & since that time it is in the world. But that sin has entered into the world, has begun to exist, has happened by one man, namely, Adam. All stress lies on the εἰς ὅν θείν ἀνθρώπου, which is placed foremost. This one man, the first man, Adam, has sinned, walked contrary to the holy will of God, & even thereby sin has made its appearance on earth, even with that sin, which in general existed only in concreto, entered into existence. The sin of Adam was the beginning & origin of all human transgression.

"And durch die Hände der Tod" ("and death by sin"), καὶ εἰς τῆς ἀμαρτίας εὐάνατος. Thus it reads further. Out of the first part of the sentence, moreover, not only the predicate εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσεῖν is to be taken over, but also the emphasized εἰς ὅν θείν ἀνθρώπου, which is placed at the head of the sentence of comparison. By the one man by means of sin death has come into the world. Adam had sinned & the effect & punishment of his sin was death. And in & with the death of Adam death has entered into the world, death had made its appearance on earth.

187.
512-17.

had begun to exist. The death of Adam was the beginning of human death. $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ designated first of all & for the most part the bodily death, but then also often the final, terrible destiny of his man, eternal death, as, for example, 11 Cor. 2, 16; 2, 10; James 1, 15; 5, 20; 1 John 5, 16. Death is, as Bener, for example, expresses himself, once the end of life, of this natural life, another time the opposite of life, of the true life of life from God & with God, of eternal life. We also speak well of a spiritual death, & this idiom has foundation in the Scriptures. It reads, for example, in Eph. 2, 1, 5, that we were dead in sin. Then, however, we use the word "death" or "dead" in a figurative sense, of the moral deadness, of the complete inability of the natural man to any good. Death in the real sense of the word is no moral quality, but the fate which man has drawn down upon himself by his conduct which is contrary to God. Even in the foregoing section the concepts $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ are sharply kept apart from one another, thus conduct & fate of man are distinguished from one another. Bener closes his examination of the concept $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in the N. T. with the statement: "In the usually still accepted meaning of the spiritual-moral deadness, $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (even this statement) is not found in the N. T." & our place now, as in the entire passage, vv. 12-21, Paul understands under $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ death in the full sense of the word, the total punishment of sin, both in one, physical death & eternal death, or we can also say physical death, which for sinful man, who dies in his sin, becomes eternal death. For the two meanings he not outside one another, but in one another. Weiser remarks very correctly: "To be sure, $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ often stands concerning eternal death, but that is no other meaning of the word, since physical death, if it is not again raised up, thus the resurrection to heavenly life, self-evidently becomes eternal death." That the Apostle has in mind in this connection this latter sense of physical death, that is, eternal death, comes forth also from the fact that in v. 21 he contrasts the $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ with $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. When he writes: "and death by sin," he refers to the threat & the judgment of the punishment of God in Gen. 2, 17; 3, 19: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "Dust thou art, & unto dust shalt thou return." God had sentenced the first man to death & decomposition, after he had sinned, had eaten of the forbidden fruit. And on the same day when he ate thereof the carrying out of the threat, the execution of the sentence of death began. On the same day the seed of death was planted into his nature, from that hour on his body was a mortal body, in which one perceived all the symptoms of death & decomposition. "The threat of death in Gen. 2, 17 reads not $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ but $\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. It does not contradict it thus, that death is in not an instantaneous act, but a process beginning from that moment, whose final outcome is here (3, 19) announced to man. Men die when they fall into sin, as according to Hos. 13, 1 Ephraim died, when he bowed down to Baal. Their life is therefore a slow but sure ripening of the seed of death, which they carry within themselves." Pelitzsch. Thus immediately after the fall into sin in & with the destiny of punishment which Adam bore & not first with the murder of Abel, death has entered into the world. And certainly the death which from its first beginning had in itself the seed & the word of eternal death. The threat of death reads: "thou shalt surely die." For the dying of the first man God had used this strong, full expression. When Adam had sinned, he acted immediately the full terror of death, had also a foreboding of his damnation. With

188.
5, 12-14.

his sin Adam had forfeited his life, even also the blessed life in the communion of God, & also the blessed life of glory into which he would have passed over gradually, if he would have withstood the test. (p. 1 Cor. 15, 46.)

Adam had passed into death because of his sin, also by right with regard to eternal death, & would have become and remained a prey of eternal death, if the promise of the seed of the woman & the faith in the promise had not entered into the process of death & had turned away the worst end.

The third part of the sentence: "und also der Tod zu allen Menschen durchgedrungen ist" ("and so death passed upon all men"), is the goal of the comparative statement. In any case death is the subject of this statement, even if one follows the more weakly attested reading, which here does not offer the $\delta \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \circ \varsigma$. With the $\epsilon \iota \varsigma \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma \kappa \alpha \iota \theta \nu \omega \nu \circ \varsigma$ $\delta \iota \eta \lambda \beta \epsilon \nu$ the spread of death over all mankind is described. Death had, first of all, in & with Adam's death, set its foot into the world, $\epsilon \iota \varsigma \eta \lambda \theta \epsilon$, and has then passed upon, $\delta \iota \eta \lambda \beta \epsilon$, all mankind, has taken possession of all the children of Adam. Death, as it were, accompanies the branching out of the human race. All men, already from conception & birth, are subject to death. Every child of Adam, every man who is born into the world, brings along a mortal, weak, frail body into the world, his entire life of the body is a movement toward death, & when he has ceased to live, has died, then he dies away, falls away as the flower of the grass, becomes earth, dust & ashes, yes, if nothing else enters in between, he must die eternally & be condemned. The emphasis in this portion of the sentence, however, lies on the $\theta \nu \omega \varsigma$, and this $\theta \nu \omega \varsigma$, also, "so, auf die angegebene Weise," in the given manner, goes back to the stressed $\delta \iota \epsilon \nu \theta \circ \varsigma \kappa \alpha \iota \theta \nu \omega \nu \circ \varsigma$. Thus the one man, & certainly by means of his sin it has happened that death has passed upon all men. This reference of $\theta \nu \omega \varsigma$ is cleared out of question by the expression $\epsilon \iota \varsigma \delta \iota \epsilon \nu \theta \circ \varsigma \alpha \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \tau \circ \varsigma$, "wie durch einen, der gesündigt hat" ("as one that sinned"), V. 16, which looks back to V. 14. The one man, Adam, whose sin is the origin not only of the death of this first man, but of the death of all men, & the individuals, everyone for himself, have not incurred death for themselves, with themselves. For that there also already testifies the fact that that man, from the first, from the first beginning of his existence, is subject to death. Eittingly & sharply Hofmann has presented this napae rerum and proven it out of this text, in that he writes: "The express distinction that first of all sin, but death then sin has come into the world, has misled to this, the reference back, with which the apostle continues, when he writes $\kappa \alpha \iota \theta \nu \omega \varsigma \epsilon \iota \varsigma \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma \kappa \alpha \iota \theta \nu \omega \nu \circ \varsigma \delta \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \circ \varsigma$ $\delta \iota \eta \lambda \beta \epsilon \nu$, this to comprehend, when $\theta \nu \omega \varsigma$ refers to the original connection between sin & death... but one should first consider that then it must be settled, how death has come to the first man, & not how it has come into the world by the first man. And secondly, $\delta \iota \epsilon \nu \theta \circ \varsigma$ $\alpha \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \tau \circ \varsigma$ is still only taken as subordinate place in the sentence, which governs the $\delta \iota \epsilon \nu \theta \circ \varsigma$... $\kappa \alpha \iota \theta \nu \omega \nu \circ \varsigma$ which is placed at the head, that that cannot be, which with the reference back has stressed pre-dominantly on this sentence. $\theta \nu \omega \varsigma$ must refer back to $\delta \iota \epsilon \nu \theta \circ \varsigma \kappa \alpha \iota \theta \nu \omega \nu \circ \varsigma$. The contracting manner, how death could have come upon all men, would have been this: that every single one would draw it down upon himself. Instead of that, death was in the world once for all times by one man by means of sin, & then, when

180.
5, 12-14.

ἐφ' ᾧ as a neuter, "bei dem Vorhandensein welcher Verhältnisse." 3. The translation of Luther: "dieweil sie alle gesündigt haben", is now almost agreeably adopted & generally recognized, that ἐφ' ᾧ is as much as ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι, propterea quod. Of the quotations from profane writings, which Meyer has introduced as proof of this meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ, ἐφ' οἷς, we mention here only the example adduced by Eusebius: ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν κλίσιν ἐργάσω, κοίλας θόρυ, "dieweil du den Tisch nicht hast, wirst du gestraft werden." In the New Testament ἐφ' ᾧ is found in still two other places, and certainly evidently in the sense of quod: 1. Cor. 5, 4: καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐσμὲν, ἐφ' ᾧ οὐ βέλομεν ἐκ κόσμου ἔσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἐν κόσμῳ ἔσθαι, "wir empfinden und sind beschwert, dieweil wir nicht entkleidet, sondern überkleidet werden wollen" ("for we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon"); Phil. 3, 12: εἰς ἡμᾶς εἰ ἡμεῖς κατελάβωμεν, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήφθημεν ἐπὶ τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, "ich jage ihn aber nach, ob ich so auch ergreifen möchte, dieweil ich von Christo Jesu ergreifen bin." ("I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus"). But now the question is: How is this sentence, "dieweil sie alle gesündigt haben" ("for that all have sinned"), to be understood? Most modern expositors take issue concerning "the individual sins of individuals" & understand the Apostle there, that death has passed upon all men, that all men must die, because they have all actually sinned. Thus, for example, Baur, Schenck, Tholuck, Kritische, De Wette, Ewald, Umbreit, Lange, Weiss & Althardt. Still then the Apostle could here say just the opposite of that which, according to our understanding, he had said in the preceding three part ~~perhaps~~ principle clause. In order not to permit him to fall into such "relativen" contradiction with himself, the expositors concerned have therefore seen themselves obligated to dispose of the thought of the preceding words that also sin has passed upon all men. That the text, as it stands, does not state this, we have proven above. The correct understanding of the words ὁ πᾶς ὁ ἀνθρώπος... ὁ ἄνθρωπος, the thought that the sin of the one man is the cause of the death of all men, excludes positively the thought that the individuals with their individual sins have first drawn death to themselves. And it is as plain and clear when Althardt, who essentially explains the first three parts of the verse correctly, seeks to unite these two statements with one another, with the rather dark remark: "Thus there is here, to be sure, an imputatio peccati Adamiti, but one which is mediated thru one's own transgression, aber so unmittelbar gehört, dass diese ja selbst erst durch Adams in die Welt hereinkommende Sünde bedingt ist." Thus there is nothing else left than that with Bengel, Kottje, Meyer, Philippi, Fichtzsch, Kahnis, Eodet, & Hodge, we, in 4., point the sentence, "dieweil sie alle gesündigt haben", to the fact that they have all sinned in & with Adam, or that they have sinned! Simul peccante or cooperante, quo Adamus peccavit. A similar expression is found in 11 Cor. 5, 14: εἰ ἐφ' ᾧ πᾶς τὸν ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον. That means, in & with Christ, in that Christ died, all have died. And so in & with Adam all have sinned. The objection, that the essential definition would be intended arbitrarily, is incorrect; for only the modifier of ἁμαρτωλῶν is maintained, which the immediate connection had

prepared with necessity. Meyer, the Apostle had previously said that by the sin of one man death had come upon all men, & this statement he confirms by the fact that they all have sinned namely, in that the one man sinned. Because the sin of Adam was the sin of all men, therefore it has brought death to all men. Consequently Augustine's statement: omnes in Adam peccaverunt, is a fact except that one dare not thereby combine the gross material conception, as if all men had already in Adam sinned, as if they all, because their will was decided in the will of their ancestor, had de facto joined along in that first sin. Now for Adam's sin was the sin of all men I can explain in the parallel statement in v. 19: Σὺ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεβόησθε οἱ πολλοί. By the disobedience of one man many, that means all men, have been put down as sinners, have been placed before God & thus stand before God as sinners. God regards them all as sinners because of the disobedience of Adam. In other words: God has imputed the sin of Adam to all men. Finally we still call attention to this fact in advance, that the here-presented interpretation of Rom. 5:12 is justified by the entire preceding discussion, especially by such expressions as: τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι, οἱ πολλοὶ ἡνέκυνεν, v. 15; τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς, v. 17. Cp. also 1 Cor. 15, 22: ἐν τῷ ᾧ ἦσαν πάντες ὡς ὁ θύς κούβιν. These statements express, only with somewhat different, exactly the same thing as the statement with which the Apostle begins the foregoing section.

There is now introduced, as a proof for the above statement (v. 12), an historical fact. v. 12, 14. Paul points to the time "bis auf das Gesetz" ("until the law"), ἕως νόμου, thus to the time before the Law. When sin was in the world. Still where there is no law, sin shall not be accounted, ἐλογεῖται, as Phil. 2, which means as the following shows, is not set to the account of man by God as a transgression of a divine commandment. Similarly it reads in 4:15: "Where no law is, there is no transgression." But still death reigned, ἐβασίλευσε, from Adam until Moses also over those who had not sinned after the similitude of the transgression of Adam, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ ἀμαρτήσασιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιωματι τῆς παραβίασεως ᾧ ἦσαν. These latter words are coordinated to the designation of time ἀπὸ ᾧ ἦσαν μὲχρι Μωσέως, two things the Apostle states concerning the reign of death, first, over which time it stretched, from Adam to Moses, & then, who were its objects. Death ruled not only over those who have sinned like Adam, who have transgressed a law, as over the men of the Mosaic & post-Mosaic time, but also or even (καὶ) over those who have not sinned after the manner of the transgression of Adam, over the men who lived from Adam till Moses. There are not, as for example Fritzsche & Meyer suppose, two classes distinguished among the latter: such who sinned without the law, & such who had & transgressed a law. When Paul had previously designated the time before Moses simply as a lawless time. The men of that first period of the world, from Adam till Moses, had thus sinned, but since they had no positive law, sinned not "in the similitude of Adam's transgression" ("nach der Ähnlichkeit der Verletzung Adams"). Thus with Grimm's deliverly & with most of the transgression expositors, we best of all translate the expression ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιωματι τῆς παραβίασεως

192.
5, 12-14.

ἡ δὲ ψυχή, in that we understand ἐνί, as, for example in Luke 1, 59, concerning the norms, secundum similitudinem praeviationis lidae. It amounts to the same thing, when with Brenner one takes ὁμοίωμα also in our passage in the concrete meaning "beast", form, & points to the expressions of Paul to the fact that the sin of those first men did not have the form of the sin of Adam; the form of transgression. Only one would then have rather expected ἐν ὁμοίωμα. The sin of Adam was in optima forma na p 615, transgression of a very special divine command. One even upon the transgression of this command had the punishment of death been placed. If God had given ~~had~~ Adam the command: "Of the tree of the knowledge of good & evil, thou shalt not eat of it," He continued: "for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2, 17. The announcement of the execution of the threat of death. He introduces with the words: "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of the wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee saying; 'thou shalt not eat of it.'" Gen. 3, 17. Thus the transgression of the positive command appears as the actual cause of death. But now not only in general are all the children of Adam placed under the power of death, but even also already the first generations of the human race, who had no such positive command, as Adam, no positive law, as since the time of Moses, there also were no transgressors. Concerning the reign of terror of death in the pre-Mosaic time there testifies, for example, very expressly "the book of the generations of Adam. Gen. 5. I here each of the sketches of the life of the devout patriarchs of mankind closes with the significant, earnest I. D. Y. and he died. How is this fact to be explained? Not out of the sins which these first generations of men had committed themselves, since to them there was lacking the characteristic of transgression! But there remains only the assumption that those sinners of the first period of the world had fallen to death because of the one transgression of Adam. And thus the statement in v. 12 is proven. For evidently all men die in the same manner, like the first thousands & millions have died. The general reign of death, which began already in the days of Adam, settled itself on earth in the centuries before Moses & the same has remained & remains there all times, in ^{as the} ~~for~~ example, of the first generations of men, ^{as the} actually established in the sin of the first man. This argumentation of the hypothesis is so evident, that it appears superfluous to follow up the intricate ways of those expositors, who from the sentence structure of v. 12, 14 draw a proof for the universality of sins.

What the Apostle here states regarding death is not everything that the Scriptures teach regarding death & the relationship of death to sin. According to the Scriptures death is in genere the wages of sin. That last Paul likewise testifies in the letters to the Romans, 6, 23. There he admonishes the Christians, who have & know the revealed fact, not to again become obedient to sin, & confirms this admonition with the fact that with the service of sin with their transgression they would merit death. the eternal life is the undeserved, free gift of God, not death the deserved reward, 6, 24 v. 10. or what is the same, the deserved punishment of sin. And that applies very generally, that death is the wages of sin, also regarding the Gentiles & the sin of the Gentiles.

193.
5, 12-14.

who have no positive Law, is also no real transgression of the Law, they are still answerable to God for their actions. They have an equivalent for the revealed Law in the law which is written in their hearts. That the people had proven in 2, 4 ff. And because they knew the legal demands of God & doing the same with their evil, shameful works, therefore they are guilty of death. 2, 510: 5, 12: 10: 1, 32. "As many as have sinned without the Law shall also perish without Law." 2, 12. Paul had previously presented the death of Christ as a sacrificial death. At the base of the sacrifice, however, as we have shown above, lies the axiom: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Yes, the Scripture goes a step farther & teaches that already by nature, from our birth on, we are children of wrath because of original sin. From all that the Spirit has said away in our passage. Still, what he does say here does not stand in contradiction with the above mentioned statement of the Scripture. Otherwise Paul would contradict himself. Rom. 5, 12-14 deals specially with the first beginning, with the source of death, with the origin of this historical fact, the general reign of death on the earth. And therefore it explains how that the one transgression of Adam, as the originator, expresses themselves, with causa primaria, the real causa efficiens, the effecting cause of death, & certainty of the death of all men. Certainly every sin, even if it still has not become a recognized transgression, already that God's hostile ruling in the heart makes man unworthy, the evil which is given by God & worthy of death. But according to His wisdom.

(which we cannot follow & should not investigate, it has pleased God, that He has actually covered the transgression of a positive command, the first transgression of the Law of the first man with the punishment of death, & then accounted the transgression of Adam to all men & for that reason from the very beginning has subjected the entire race of man to death, so that all men alike have been born to death. Even this death, however, which the one sin of Adam has brought into the world & upon all men, which now ever from the beginning on, since the fall into sin of the first man is & reigns in the world, God now at the same time uses to His purpose, that He thereby punishes also the individual transgressions & the inborn sinfulness of the individual. Above, under 2, 4 ff. we have quoted the passage from our Confession, where it reads: "Iniqua esse eterna vita a reward, not that God is obliged to give eternal life for the sake of works, but that eternal life has been given otherwise for other reasons, that nevertheless our works & tribulations are thereby rewarded." Similarly we can say here, that with death, which for other reasons, namely, because of the one sin of Adam, has been inflicted upon the entire race of man, likewise also the evil works of all the individual children of Adam shall be rewarded. Very fitting is the remark of Bengel on this, which Philippi gives in his quotation: *hanc unius lapsus more multorum assignatur immediate sic non negativè, cupis in creatis dignis*

hanc unius lapsus more multorum assignatur immediate sic non negativè, cupis in creatis dignis
(hanc unius lapsus more multorum assignatur immediate sic non negativè, cupis in creatis dignis)
generant: sicut iatro post homicidium furatur, punitur ob homicidium, nec furum in iure punitur
et, sicut iatro in iure homicidium confluenti, sed ad homicidium non in iure punitur. Finally
we must here still consider that death, as it is now as it is punishment of individual sin & as the sin-
fulness of the individual, has its final roots in the sin of Adam. For this sin was the foundation and

194.
5.15-17.

cause, that from that hour on Adam's nature was completely changed & disturbed, was entirely injured and corrupted, & that this natural corruption descended upon all the children of Adam & out of the children of Adam came forth nothing but evil fruit & works. However, the discourse in Rom. 5, 12 ff. is not of that fact.

To the name ἡ Σίμ in v. 14 there is still added a relative clause ὅς ἐστι τὸ πρὸς τοῦ μελλόντος. Τὸ πρὸς, really a coinage from τὸ πρὶς, means: impression from a blow, mark, sign, thus τὸ πρὸς τῶν ἐλλείνων, nail prints, John 20, 25; then, picture, form, thus τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνου, a form of teaching, Rom. 3, 17; especially pattern, as in most N. T. passages, as 1 Thess. 3, 9: ἐκ τούτου τὸ πρὸς ὁμοίαν ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἁμαρτάν; 1 Thess. 1, 7; Phil. 3, 17; 1 Tim. 4, 12; Tit. 2, 7; 1 Pet. 5, 3; and finally, prophetic pattern, which we call a type, as in 1 Cor. 10, 6, 11 and in our passage. Adam is a type τοῦ μελλόντος, i.e. ἡ Σίμ. This is not a direct identification of Christ in Adam. As in 1 Cor. 15, 45 Christ is called ὁ ἐσχάτος ἡ Σίμ, "the last Adam", & here, from the standpoint of the first Adam, He is called ὁ μελλών ἡ Σίμ, "der zukünftige Adam", "him that was to come". As saying of the Rabbin reads: Postremus Adamus est Messias. Many expositors, like Tholuck, Koellner, Philippi, Meyer, Weiss & Luthardt, see now in these words the apodictic, or at least a virtual apodictic or a substitution for the apodictic to the protasis which began in v. 12 with ὅτι περ. But for this the relative clause is neither grammatically nor actually suitable. It says nothing of the fact how far Adam is a type of Christ, of wherein the similarity between Adam & Christ consists. It only observes that Adam is Christ's type, only brings the same thought into expression, which already lies in the ὅτι περ in v. 12, & thus, after the protasis in v. 12 is amplified by the demonstration, v. 13, 14, he reminds the readers once again that what has been said of Adam in v. 12-14 should introduce a corresponding statement concerning Christ. Certainly such a reminder would be improper & disturbing, if now the οὕτως, which corresponds to the ὅτι περ, would immediately follow. But that is certainly not the case. The thought much rather continues with

Vv. 15-17.

"Nicht wie der Fall, so auch die Kadengabe" ("not as the offense, so also in the free gift"), οὕτως ὅτι τὸ πρὸς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρις, and "nicht wie durch einen, also gesündigt hat, sondern durch" ("not as it was by one that sinned, so in the gift"), οὕτως ὅτι ἐν ὁμοίαν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τὸ χάρις. These are the two principle statements, which stand out & are proven in this sentence structure. By means of the restrictive ἁλλά, "but", this is added on to the preceding relative clause, ὅς ἐστι τὸ πρὸς τοῦ μελλόντος, and with that to the comparison introduced with ὅτι περ in v. 12. The connection of thought is the following. Wherein the typical parallel, the similarity between the first & the future Adam consists, the apostle had still not given expression verba. Still according to all that he had taught previously concerning Christ, Rom. 8, 3, 10, especially also according to the deduction in 5, 5-11, in which he concluded regarding His already

196.
5, 15-17.

not consider their individual sins as cause efficiens, or also only medians, so one does wrong, when
one interprets: "The many sinned & found death, like the first Adam." Instead of "all men" Paul
here writes "the many," οἱ πολλοί, whereby he naturally means all men, in order to create an impression
of a great multitude. To form this contrast to the εἷς, to come forth most strongly, Possunt aliqui esse
omnes, quae non sunt multus. Augustine. It is an ingenue nominum numerus ("fruitless"), one -
which the minority of the one has brought death. And now if from the fact of the one man's sin died as it is
really the case, then much rather how true & proper of the line stretched out over the many, that is the
meaning of the type. That the ἵππευξ, like the ἰσχυρὸς αἴμαξ, has infinite effect passed over the whole
one to the many, that is the exact parallel. What makes Corinthian Antijean of Adam? The truth is, πολλοί
"nichilum", "rather," however, denotes a difference in the parallel, when one compares the ἰσχυρὸς αἴμαξ and
the ἵππευξ exactly with one another, thus on the side of the ἵππευξ and its dissemination over the many
as there is to be recorded. Thod. v. w. d. o. i. here designates, as usually, each in 5, 8, 10, 17, not multo magis
but muito potius, "nichilum", "rather," in its sense of "viel eher" (much more) intelligens: much more
certainly), & thus designates, as one has called it, a "logical plus": "evident certainty". This is a
logical plus, as Lange correctly remarks, involves a real plus. Paul here in v. 15 b rewrites the concept
ἵππευξ in such a manner that it comes to the foreground immediately how far the ἵππευξ sur-
passes the ἰσχυρὸς αἴμαξ. What he compares to the ἰσχυρὸς αἴμαξ in vs. 14 c ὁ πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῦ, the grace, the
gracious disposition which God has shown, & the gift, which exists in the grace of the one man Jesus
Christ, in the grace which Jesus Christ has shown. We combine the modifiers ἐν ἡμῖν, τῇ τοῦ ἐν
ἐν θεῷ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ (ἵππευξ) not with ἐπιπέσειεν, but, as most expeditious, with ὁ δ' αὐτοῦ, which needs
such a supplement. Otherwise one would not know what kind of a gift is meant. The ἵππευξ ὁ τοῦ ἐν
ἐν θεῷ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ ἵππευξ is the congruent correlate to τῇ τοῦ ἐν θεῷ ἰσχυροῦ αἴμαξ. But in the grace
of the one man Jesus Christ the grace of God preeminent, ὁ πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῦ. And the grace of God is an
entirely different power, is much greater, stronger & richer than the minority of the one man. Therefore
also concerning the grace of God & the grace of Jesus Christ it is not only said that it has come upon the
many, but that it has abounded unto many, has poured itself out richly upon the many, ἐπερίβυσσε σὺν
αὐτῷ θεῷ who according to His strong righteousness, because of the minority of one, has brought it
upon the many, therefore one can define the difference the plus, as Meyer does it: "God has rather poured
His favor forth than His severity," or to speak with Frutze: Deus multo benignior est quam severior,
sed because that is so, because here boundless grace, the grace of God in Christ, flows in the balance scale,
therefore all who suffer under the guilt of the sin of Adam, can be saved & are much more certain that they
also have share in the ἵππευξ of Christ. Similarly, Hofmann explains our passage: "Nachdem die
Vielzahl gleichwie toll der Menschheit erlitten konnte, so ist es einleuchtend, dass das
Wirkende gar nicht anders, göttliche und menschliche, göttliche, als auch welche unerschöpflich"

198.
5, 15-17.

type. On the one side, the typical, applies: $\text{Si } \epsilon\upsilon\varsigma \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. But $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is $\tau\omicron \text{ } \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$; Bengel: $\tau\omicron \text{ } \kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$; Hodge: $\tau\omicron \text{ } \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$. That is too specific. The expression in general needs no real grammatical supplement. The Greek likes shortened comparisons. On that he comes to speak of a second difference, the type of the first of all presents only the characteristic keyword. His meaning, as the context shows, is this: Only the typical side, what concerns Adam, the $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$, is that which has happened, which has come over the many, has happened, has been occasioned by one who has sinned. Thus similarly also Philippi, who supplies only $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omicron$. On the one side stands the $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, upon whom nothing comes, it concerns the other side, the antitype, the $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, is to be noted here first of all only that it does not conduct itself with that as with the type. That means. The characteristic $\text{Si } \epsilon\upsilon\varsigma \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in the type has no exact correlate in the anti type.

"Kann das Urtheil ist von Einem her nur Verurtheilung geworden, die Strafen aber werden nicht durch vieler Sünden beschleunigt" ("for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justifications"). Thus it reads, further in v. 6: On the side of the type, of the $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ it stands thus: $\tau\omicron \text{ } \omega\epsilon\upsilon \nu\alpha \rho \kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha \text{ } \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma \text{ } \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The judgment which God has placed upon man kind has become, has resulted in condemnation, in a judgment of damnation. Evidently with $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$ the apostle has in mind the death of which he had spoken in v. 16 of the general reign of death, of which he speaks in v. 17a. Still $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$ and $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ are not completely identical concepts. Death, the reign of death is the execution of the divine judgment of punishment, the latter is the carrying out of the first. The emphasis however, lies upon the $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. From one as it came forth, that man has been sentenced to death. The nature of the matter here brings it with itself that we designate $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ closer to its fact, that the one was the cause of the $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$. The one who had sinned had with his sin, his transgressions, occasioned, was the cause of the judgment of death which was pronounced upon man in general. The sin of Adam was according to v. 12 the sin of all men, has been imputed to all men as sin. How does it conduct itself, on the other hand, on the other, the antitypical side? Here it applies: $\tau\omicron \text{ } \text{Si } \chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma \text{ } \epsilon\kappa \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \text{ } \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon \text{ } \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \text{ } \text{Si } \kappa\alpha\iota \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The free gift of grace has become, has resulted in $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ from the offenses of many. It is very close to translate $\text{Si } \kappa\alpha\iota \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ with "Recht, richtig, richtig" "judgment of justifications". But this translation does not permit itself to be justified grammatically. According to the authenticated idiom $\text{Si } \kappa\alpha\iota \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, to speak with Newman, means either "Recht, richtig, richtig" "ordering" or "Das Rechte, das Wirkliche" "that stand"; either, as we can also say: "Recht, richtig", legal statute, as much as demand of the Law, commandment, or the fact of the cause of justification, as much as fulfillment of the Law, righteousness. In the first meaning the word is found, for example, in Luke 1, 2; Rom. 1, 2; 2, 2; 7, 4; in the latter in Rom. 17, 5: $\tau\omicron \text{ } \text{Si } \kappa\alpha\iota \text{ } \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ "the legal death"

ing) τὸν ἑαυτοῦ; 15:41. τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου (the proof of your justification) ἐκ ἀνερρώτητων, even so
in Rom. 7, 10, where the expressions τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου and ἐκ ἀνερρώτητων interchange with
one another, & evidently also in Rom. 5, 18, where it appears as a synonym of ἑταίρειαν; in v. 19. And the latter
meaning δικαιοσύνη also has in our passage, as Luther has then very correctly translated it with "Berechtigung",
"justification". In the following verse therefore δικαιοσύνη is substituted. Let it be evident, however,
"Berechtigung", "Berechtigung", "justification" is meant in the sense of justitia imputata. Thus also with this
interpretation the contrast between κατὰ ἔργα and δωρεὰν remains unaltered. Thus the gift of grace
has redounded to the fact that the men who had been condemned because of the iniquities of Adam are now righteous
ones who have God's judgment for themselves. It is that which God, whose love has given to men by grace -
the righteousness which awaits before God. The apostle could have expressed himself more fully, as in the
following verse, that the gift exists in the righteousness. But he chooses the form of speech διὰ δικαιοσύνης because
here also he would contrast ἐκ and διὰ with one another. Here also the emphasis rests on the modifier which
is introduced with ἐκ. The ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτώματις has the same which means: "von denselben
vielen Verbrechen" ("of many offences"). The contrast to the preceding towards ἐκ demands for πολλῶν the
designation of the masculine. A similar combination is ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν, and Verbrüderungen ("of many
hearts"), Luke 2, 35. The preposition ἐκ designates here merely the direction, from whence. The mean-
ing is: from the offences of many, this was the former state of affairs as it came to the fact of the case of right-
eousness. When one takes ἐκ in our passage as causative & reads the words ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτώματις
to the fact that the many transgressions have either drawn after themselves or called, or that the
δικαιοσύνη, like Biederkeit, as a necessity, then one gains a thought which, as already remarked above,
lies far outside of the entire context. The discussion, that it has come to δικαιοσύνη, is in an offence of
many, however now says nothing else than that the many, that is, all men are justified, involved of all
their transgressions. The righteousness which awaits before God, as we have seen, is to the divine
identical with the forgiveness of sins. And thus there is forgiveness, not only the one transgression of
the one, which had been accounted to them all, but all men are forgiven also all their individual sins &
transgressions. Christ has, as Philippi correctly remarks, not only healed the injury which Adam caused,
but also that which we ourselves have added to the same.

There follows in v. 19 a conclusion which is similar to that in v. 18. εἰ ὅτι τὸν τοῦ ἐνός παραπτώματος ὁ
ἀνάκτορος ἐκαστοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, πολλῶν καὶ οὐ τὴν τοιοῦτον ὅτι χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς

) τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ᾧ ἑνὶ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἐνός ἡμεῖς ὁριστοῦ;
"dann wenn durch den Fall des einen der Tod geherrscht hat durch den einen, so werden wir viel mehr
die, welche die Fülle der Gnade und die Gabe der Berechtigung empfangen, im Leben herrschen durch den
einen, Jesus Christum" ("for if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abund-
ance of grace & of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ"). Here also as in 15:4,

200.
5, 15-17.

The type is judged by the Antitype. In the protasis we follow the action-reception: $\tau\omega\ \tau\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon$, which is more plausible than the variants $\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon$ or $\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon$. This is the type: By the one, by the fall or misstep of the one it has happened that a death was experienced for all on earth, that all the children of Adam, from the beginning are subject to death. However, if that is so, as it really is the case, then much rather, much more certain ($\mu\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$) was the other thing happened, of which the apostle speaks, so shall we much rather, much more certainly reign in life. The reign of life is, on the side of the Antitype, the correlate to the reign of death. The concept "life" the apostle has in mind likewise in the beginning of the statement of comparison, when he, in the protasis which is introduced with $\delta\iota\ \tau\omega\ \nu\upsilon\ \epsilon\gamma$, called special attention to the general spreading out of death. The reign of life is a different kind of reign than the reign of death. There death is the $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, the tyrant, who reduces men to servitude & bite them, feel his power of terror. There the men who stand in life are the rulers, $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. The life, the life out of death, the eternal life as freedom concludes all force, yes, raises up those who attain it to sovereignty. Also otherwise the Scripture describes the future $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ as arising, reigning & governing. $\text{1 Cor. 6: 2; 5: 2, 3; 1 Tim. 2: 2; Rev. 2: 26, 27, 28}$. But now it says that those who receive, receive in the present the gift of justification, that is, the gift that consists in justification, shall in the future reign in life. The life, the reign of life has the righteous men which awaits before God as its supposition, even as death, the reign of death presumes on the $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon$. Already in the presentation of the theme of the Letter in 1, 6, 17, the $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ is seen as the preliminary condition of the future $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. And in 5, 6-11 the justification was judged by the future $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. That man must become righteous, righteous before God, must be freed from the guilt of sin before he can attain eternal life. That is the gift of God. $\tau\omega\ \gamma\alpha\pi\ \epsilon\gamma\omega$, $\tau\omega\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$: first the justification, then the eternal life. We translate $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ with Luther & most of the exegetes: "die, so da empfangen", not: "die das himmelreich". For the life does not depend on the act of the taking, but on the gift of justification & on the fact that the individual partakes of this gift for his person, receives it as his own. That takes place by faith. Thus the expression $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, even if one takes it as a receiving, certainly involves the concept faith. Still faith comes into consideration insofar as it does this & takes the gift, but insofar as it enters into the personal possession of the gift, which it applies to itself. Only the believers are those who shall de facto reign in life in the future. It has certainly come to $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ for the many, for all men. And as a result of that heaven stands open to all men. Salvation has been offered, for all men, and only he who appropriates the gift of righteousness in faith & thereby receives it as his own, really receives life. Those who reject & despise this $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ go away empty & destroy, for themselves the riches & fruits of the same, eternal salvation. The object of $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, however, there appears now not only simply the gift of justification, but $\tau\omega\ \nu\upsilon\ \tau\epsilon\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \nu\upsilon\ \gamma\alpha\pi\ \tau\omega\ \nu\upsilon\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, the emphasis lies upon this expanded designation of its object in the gift of righteousness the grace, the gracious dispo-

Si εὐός ἀνὰ πρῶτον is characteristic. And with the entire sentence structure in vv. 16, 17 at the same time a second proof is offered for the principle clause in v. 15a, the general statement, that the ἁπάρ-
τωμα and the ἥμιπρω in general differs from one another.

Thereby there is also clarified the second point of the difference in the typical parallel between Adam & Christ, which Paul asserts in these two verses, vv. 16, 17. Hofmann sees the difference in the Σικαίωμα and the gift of righteousness, in which nothing similar corresponds in the connection between the one side of the one & the immediately given reign of death. But in the latter the καὶ ἥμιπρω certainly corresponds to the Σικαίωμα. Hodel, in v. 17, lays the emphasis on οἱ ἡμάρτανες and takes ἡμάρτιαν as a "tätige Bedingung," a moral condition, on which the reign of life depends; such a condition is, bound only on the side of salvation, not on the other side. But the tree lies, as we have shown above, on the object of ἡμάρτιαν; and the subjective conduct of man would be a very weak & insecure basis for the certainty of life. Philipp Meyer Weiss & most of the expositors acknowledge that the apostle in v. 16 calls special attention to the discrepancy between εὐός ἀνὰ πρῶτον and εἰς εὐός on the one side and ἐκ πολλῶν ἁπαρτωνμάτων on the other side. But with the ἐκ πολλῶν ἁπαρτωνμάτων εἰς Σικαίωμα is even the περιεεῖα τῆς ἁρτίτης καὶ τῆς ὁμιλίας τῆς εἰκασιδοῦντος in v. 17 to be identified. We recall to mind once again in short the result of the exegesis given above. In v. 15 the οἱ πολλοὶ and εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς were stressed. In v. 16, 17 the emphasis lies on the double εὐός, resp. Si εὐός, εἰς εὐός. The Si εὐός applies to both sides. By the one who had incurred the judgment of condemnation & death has come upon all men, by the one Jesus Christ righteousness & life have been earned, for the children of Adam who had been condemn-
ed to death. But in this parallel, even also with regard to the Si εὐός, there is a difference, as has to be noted on the side of the ἥμιπρω. Christ has not only made good for Adam, but has put, into the many sins of all their individual transgressions, but therefore those who receive the bountiful grace & gift of right-
eousness shall much rather, much more certainly reign in life than the sin of Adam had caused death for the human race.

And when we now take together the two differences which are mentioned in v. 15 b and in vv. 16, 17, then it presents itself, that a discrepancy is inherent in the entire parallel between Adam & Christ. Altogether as plus on the side of the gift of Christ! The complete parallel runs: Both what Adam & what Christ have done have brought about has passed over from the one to the many. But both, with regard to the εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς and also with regard to the Si εὐός or εἰς εὐός the gift of Christ far surpasses the fall of Adam. The grace of Christ & the grace of God is stronger, more efficacious, passes much rather upon the many than the sin of Adam. And the gift of righteousness mediated by Christ covers far more sins than the one sin of Adam. And therefore the life is much more certain than death. And how comforting that is for poor, sinful, mortal children of Adam! Yes, what fulness of comfort lies hidden in this large, dialectic deduction of the apostle! We are all children of death because of the sin of Adam, born already under the reign of

203.
5/18/19.

death. Our entire life strives against death. Over the richest power of life dowers the cloud of death. Nothing is more certain for us than that we must die. But still, one thing is still more certain, namely, that we shall live. The life, the life out of death, of which we still see & trace nothing, is more certain for us than the death which we have before our eyes daily & can at the same time grasp with our hands. For the great, rich, & gracious God, on whose grace the life depends, much rather permits His grace to rule & work than His strict righteousness, which had sentenced all men to death because of the sin of Adam. And out of grace God has already given Christ forgiveness not only the sin of Adam, but also our numberless transgressions, great & small, known & unknown, thus no longer stands anything absolutely anything between ourselves & God. Therefore between the gift of God, eternal life, & ours? Yes, there is only the one thing necessary, that we die, that we lay aside this mortal tabernacle of the body & thereby pay the tribute to the sin of Adam; then Adam, sin & death lie far, far behind us, under us, & we enter into his throne & shall reign & triumph in life with Christ eternally.

V. 18. 19.

The sentence in v. 18 is evidently corresponds in form & content to the statement in v. 12. And something lies closer than the interpretation that the apostle, after the interruption of the construction with the words ἄρα οὖν ὅς ἐστις ὑπερῷον ἡμῶν ἐστὶν αἰώνιος καὶ ἀκρίβης, takes up again the protasis of the comparative statement in v. 12 and now with οὖν καὶ ἐστὶς ὑπερῷον ἡμῶν ἐστὶν αἰώνιος καὶ ἀκρίβης, adds the apodosis. Thus the preceding section v. 12-19 is also continued by Dr. Schmidt, Ch. Schmidt, Bengel, Hall, Keiche, Lehmann, Godet & Hodge. But Paul had established the first half of the comparison in v. 12 with v. 13, 14 and then in v. 15-17 had shown the difference in the similarity between Adam & Christ, he now comes to the point to carry out expressio verbis & to carry them from every angle the parallel which already lay at the foundation of the description of the difference.

The sentence in v. 18 needs a real grammatical supplementation as little as the similar sentence in v. 16. In order to save himself & the reader all unnecessary formalities of expression, the apostle intentionally mentions both times only a whereby & a two-fold whence, a whence of the persons & of the matter. ὁφθαλμοὶ ἀνθρώπων & οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ, in addition. We translate: "Wie es also nun durch Eines Fehlthat, so alle Menschen zur Verurtheilung gekommen ist, so durch Eines Sündthun, so alle Menschen zur Rechtfertigung der Selene". "Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life". By the fall, the offense of one, namely Adam, it has come to καὶ ἀκρίβης for all men, namely according to the connection to καὶ ἀκρίβης τοῦ ἐν ἡμῶν, it has happened that all men

204.
5/18/19.

are sentenced to death. To that it corresponds on the other side that by the δικαιοσύνη of One, namely Christ, it has come to the δικαιοσύνη, to the righteousness of life. δικαιοσύνη here, as in v. 16, designates the fact of the case of the being righteous, nevertheless not, as in v. 16, the justitia imputata, but, since Christ is here the subject, the righteousness which Christ has proven. Even Philippi, who has taken it in v. 16 as a judgment of justification, translates it here with "Rechtsprechung", judgment of the Law. And as most of the expositors. It stands in contrast to the ἀπειθήναι of Adam & is synonymous with δικαιοσύνη in v. 19. It is as much as recte factum ("Tutzeche"), righteousness of Christ (Hodge). The Apostle had previously mentioned Christ's death & blood as the foundation for justification. Nevertheless the death of Christ was not only a fate of punishment which befall Christ, but at the same time Christ's own act. Christ has given Himself for us. The atoning power of the obody sacrifice of Christ rests also in the fact that it was a willing sacrifice. Only a willing sacrifice is pleasing to God. Christ was obedient even to the death on the cross, had even proven obedience in that He died on the cross. But the content of the δικαιοσύνη of Christ goes still further, includes the entire obedience which Christ rendered to God in life, suffering & death, the obedientia activa & passiva. Christ has fulfilled all the righteousness of the Law, has satisfied not only the punishing, but also the demanding divine righteousness. Christ's entire conduct on earth, inclusive of His death, was a unitary recte factum. And by this righteousness it has now come to the δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν, for all men. The δικαιοσύνη with δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν, otherwise of ἵνα designates more in common the judgment of God over sinful mankind, that God considers & looks upon the sinners as devout & righteous, justitiam reputat, that the sinners as yet are as justified before God. In many places, however, he takes the expression δικαιοσύνη very strictly as the formal judicial pronouncement of God, as "berichten", "berichterklären", justitiam pronuntians. Thus, for example in 2, 5; 5, 33. And in this strict meaning the substantive δικαιοσύνη in both of the passages, where it is in the N. T., in 4, 25 and in our passage. Christ's righteousness has brought it to pass that all men are justified, are declared right even & that thereby life is awarded them.

The two facts manifested in v. 18 are grounded in two other closely bound facts: "ἐκ τῆς ἀπειθείας τοῦ ἑνὸς πολλοὶ ὡς ἁμαρτωροὶ ᾤκισαν" (as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous"). v. 19. By the disobedience of the one man, Adam, many, that is, all men, had been put down or presented as sinners; that is signified by κατέστησαν ὡς ἁμαρτωνοὶ, nothing else, not peccatores facti, but peccatores constituti sunt, they have come to stand before God as sinners. That means in other words to the many the disobedience of Adam has been accounted. And even therefore, because they in this manner have all come to stand as disobedient ones.

205.
5/18/19.

before God, it has come with them to the same purpose, they have been sentenced to death. This is the same connection of thought which we find in v. 12, where it said that as a result of the sin of Adam death had passed upon all men, because they had all sinned, had sinned even in & with Adam. So that there corresponds on the other side the fact that by the obedience of One many had been placed as righteous ones. The future $\kappa\alpha\tau'\alpha\beta\tau\alpha\theta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is referred to the future time, that thereby something would be designated which would first enter in on the last day (Meyer, Lohd, Luther), or something which would continue on in this time (Weiser, Philippi). For the $\kappa\alpha\tau'\alpha\beta\tau\alpha\theta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ is evidently established given, even as the $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ was. So, immediately with the $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ of Christ. It is much rather also in this passage, with $\gamma\iota\mu\alpha\iota$ rather, take the future as the logical future or, as they have also named it, the future of logical certainty, which here presents that which is given of itself from that which had previously been said concerning Adam: his disobedience & by the disobedience of one the many have come to stand before God as sinners then certainly the others shall be the case, that also by the obedience of One the many shall come to stand before God as righteous ones. And this according to time falls in the past. By the obedience of Christ the many have come to stand before God as righteous ones; the obedience of Christ has been imputed to them, & even therefore they are declared righteous, life has been acknowledged to them. The $\kappa\alpha\tau'\alpha\beta\tau\alpha\theta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ is the middle member between the $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ of Christ & the $\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ of the many, as the $\kappa\alpha\tau'\alpha\beta\tau\alpha\theta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\iota\mu\alpha\iota$ is the middle member between the disobedience of Adam & the condemnation of the many.

The righteousness which avails before God in our place, v. 18. 8 is reduced into its individual places, while the apostle otherwise speaks thereof more summarily, that we are justified or have been justified by Christ before God, that God considers us as righteous, for Christ's sake. And in all separate parts the facts of the matter with Christ also correspond to the facts of the matter with Adam. Adam has sinned, transgressed, has become disobedient. The disobedience of Adam has been accounted to all men. And therefore all men have been sentenced to death. That is the type and the antitype: Christ has fulfilled all righteousness, has become obedient. Christ's righteousness & obedience has been accounted to all men. And therefore for all men it has come to justification of life. Except that even in this parallel one does not overlook the previously presented dissimile in simile, namely, that God, who is abounding in grace, much rather, much more grants the benefactions and beneficiums of Christ to the many, than the malefactions of Adam & its fatal results, & that by Christ's obedience & righteousness not only the disobedience of Adam has been covered, but also the disobedience & the unrighteousness of the many.

The above-treated passage, vv. 18. 19, is the locus classicus for the doctrine of the general or so-called objective justification. Here the apostle teaches & testifies expressis verbis, that it has come to the righteousness of life for all men, that the many, & those are all men, have been placed before God as righteous

206.
5, 18, 19.

once, as he had already brought into prominence in v. 16, that from the glosses of many it has come to Sikaia wa, to right expanse, that all men have been justified & absolved of all their transgressions. Most modern expositors, & also already ancient expositors, refer even these apostolic dicta, to the believers, to all those who thru faith are obedient to Christ, in that they somewhat observe that such limitation presents itself of itself. But that is pure arbitrariness. When one commits himself such glosses to the text, all trustworthiness of his exegete disappears. In the three sentences mentioned faith is not mentioned with a single syllable. Philippi refers to 1 Cor. 15, 22; Rom. 8, 22; 1 Cor. 5, 18; Gal. 3, 22; 1 Thess. 5, 2, for "an entirely equally limited use of πίστις." Similarly Hodge. All these passages do not prove what they are supposed to prove. In 1 Cor. 15, 22 we read: ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Αδάμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζήσονται. Now we certainly cannot agree with Meyer, who here also understands the second πάντες of all men & finds the general resurrection of the dead taught. For the Apostle speaks in this entire context from 1 Cor. 15, 12 on only of the resurrection of life, of the resurrection of those who have fallen asleep in Christ. Likewise it would be very peculiar if one would change the πάντες before ζωοποιήσουσιν in v. 22 without any further ado into of πιστοῦ πάντες or take it in general in an unrestricted sense. Πάντες signifies "alle, all, omnes, nemine excepto" (Millyche), nothing further. But certainly it does not always designate all the members of the human race, but it can also be meant, certainly according to the context, of all the individuals who belong to a designated class of men. And so in 1 Cor. 15, 22 the discussion is regarding the men who shall in the future be raised to eternal life. The meaning of the ὡς ὡς ἡν Ἀδὰμ, by Adam all die, who die in general, & there are certainly all men, so in Christ by Christ shall all be made alive who in general have become partakers of the resurrection of life. A similar circumstance is found in Rom. 8, 32 where with τοῖς πάντες Paul points to the sum total of the elect. On the other hand, in the section Rom. 8, 12 ff. he speaks of the effect, which from the first Adam's sin through the second Adam passes upon the entire human race. And there he uses also not only the expression πάντες, but intentionally writes πάντες, ὅτι ὡς τοι, v. 12, 13, and that, as also Meyer & Hofmann acknowledge, can mean nothing else than all men without exception or all men without distinction. In the other three passages mentioned by Philippi, 1 Cor. 5, 18 "und er ist darum für alle gestorben", Gal. 3, 22 "Über die Schrift hat es allen unter die Hände beschlissen", 1 Thess. 5, 2 "denn der Glaube ist nicht jedermanns Ding" ("for all men have not faith"; cf. v. 10 πάντες τὴν πίστιν ἔχοντες), τὸν πάντα apparently applies to all men in common. When Philippi, Weiss & Collerus, contrary to this grammatically alone correct interpretation of ours of the words, εἰς πάντας, ὁ γὰρ ὡς τοι εἰς πάντας, Sikaia wai further object that the Apostle would hereby teach "die allgemeine Wiederbringung aller, restoration, but this teaching contradicts the former scriptural doctrine, so that it only proves how little these expositors have troubled themselves to inquire in the reading of the biblical text & the thought & the thought-

connection of the Epistle. Yet certainly, if Paul had written $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \kappa\alpha\theta' \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \gamma\omega\eta\varsigma$, then he would teach that all men shall finally be saved. But thus he has not written, but much rather $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\epsilon\nu \gamma\omega\eta\varsigma$, and even thereby has stated that by Christ's righteousness & obedience it has come to a judgment of justification for all men, by which life is awarded to the same, by which the same have gained a right & expectancy of salvation. On the other hand, he shows & teaches in the same context, v. 17, that the believers, $\sigma\iota \tau\eta\upsilon \tau\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \nu\iota\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\eta\varsigma \delta\omega\pi\epsilon\alpha\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\epsilon\nu \nu\eta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \beta\iota\omega\varsigma$, shall in the future actually reign in life, that thus all those who accept the gift of righteousness in faith & thus become partakers of the same personally, or, what is the same thing, that all those who apply to themselves & make use of the judgment of justification that has been pronounced over the whole sinful world & proclaimed in the Gospel shall finally actually be saved. And so what Paul teaches in Rom. 5, 1-11 agrees very well with the former doctrine of the Scripture. Moreover, he attests the truth which he expresses here also in other passages of his Letter, only with other words. We have presented above that to him justification is identical with the forgiveness of sins. And thus he writes, for example, in 1 Cor. 5, 18: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," $\mu\eta \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota \varsigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\varsigma \lambda\omicron\beta\omicron\iota\varsigma \tau\grave{\alpha} \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\iota\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \delta\omicron\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$. Thus in Christ God has already forgiven the whole world all their sins. The entire Pauline doctrine of justification & even also of all the comfort of justification stands & falls with this particular article of the general justification. Thus it is fully clear & evident that justification is completely independent of the conduct of man. And thus alone can the individual be entirely certain of his justification. For it is a compelling conclusion: If God has already justified all men in Christ & has forgiven them their sins, then I also have in Christ a gracious God & the forgiveness of all my sins. Moreover, the entire foregoing presentation of doctrine of the Apostle regarding the $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\epsilon\nu \theta\epsilon\omega$, which is presented by Christ and is offered to man in the Gospel as a ready gift, implicit even in itself, that the judgment of God designated by the $\Sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\epsilon\nu \theta\epsilon\omega$ concerns all men in common.

We still look back shortly to the long section which comes to an end in v. 19. What the Apostle brings into prominence with all sharpness in this large & grandiose parallel between Adam & Christ, that both death & life depend on one man, that we must die & be condemned because of another's guilt & receive life & salvation because of another's righteousness is certainly a provoking article for the human reason & for the pride of natural man. All attempts which men have made to diminish this offense, to make this revealed truth plausible to the human reason, as when one has taken the first & second Adam as men of a species & that the one & the other has done as acts of a species, do not relieve but only increase the difficulty. No, it is necessary here simply to believe the Scripture & to adore the wonderful, incomprehensible wisdom of God, which condemns & saves man in the manner here described. Luther emphasizes that, where he expounds the related statement in 1 Cor. 15, 22: "Es ist aber eine löcherliche Predigt, die hier St. Paulus thut, wo beide, Tod und Leben, herkommen, und lässt sich ansehen für eine groisse starke Lüge, bei der klugen Vernunft und weltlichen Weisheit, dass das ganze menschliche Gezei steht

soll um fremden Schuld willen eines einzigen Menschen allgemal sterben. Wenn es scheint ja zu ~~unbillig~~ unbillig und ungereimt, dass soll das Spiel so abenteuerlich angreifen und sich so thörlisch zu Werke stellen soll mit seinem Bericht, dass, weil Adam in einen Apfel beist, soll es so viel ausgerichtet haben, dass alle Menschen nach ihm, bis zu Ende der Welt, müssen des Todes sein. Aber was sollen wir dazu thun? Dass der Tod über uns gelit, das sehen wir alle wohl vor Augen; aber dass er daher komme, von einer geringen Sünde wegen, das lautet zu seltsam, und ist ja ungleich, wenn man's sollte mit Worten ausstreichen und gegen einander halten. Denn er hat ja keinen Mord noch Ehebruch gethan, Niemand gestohlen noch geraubt, noch Gott gelästert, oder dergleichen etwas, wie jetzt die Welt voll lästerlicher, greulicher Sünden ist, sondern nichts mehr, denn in einen Apfel gebissen, überredet und betrogen von dem Teufel, durch das Weib Missethan, denn (spricht die Vernunft) so viel von dem einzigen Apfel halten, dass die ganze Welt desselben entgelte, und sammt so vielen seinen trefflichen, weisen Leuten, ja Gottes Heilighen, sammt allen Propheten, Vätern und Heiligen, sterben müssen? Ja, wenn es noch der Tod allein wäre; wie die Welt und weise Leuten sagen, und sich trösten wider den Tod, dass er eine Ende ist alles Unglücks; ist etwas hernech, dass sie es besser sollen haben (wie sie hoffen), so nehmen sie es auch an (wiewol sie dennoch nichts Gewisses davon konnten nachsehen, von der Auferstehung aber gar nichts gewusst haben): Aber wie alle um dieser fremden Sünde willen ewige Strafe und Verdammnis wölten verdienen haben und in der Hölle leiden, und alles durch diese einzige Schuld, das geht viel weniger an einen Menschen Herz, denn es scheint ja gar unbillig gewürtheilt und unbarmherzig gehandelt von solcher hohen Majestät, welche ist die höchste Weisheit und Güte. ... Wiederum aber lautet es vor der Welt so ungereimt und lügerlich, ja viel unglaublicher, dass hier Paulus sagt, dass in Einem Menschen alle Menschen sollen auferstehen und Alles an Einem Menschen liegen und hängen beide, Tod und Leben, und alle Welt nichts dazu thun noch vermögen, und keiner Menschen Macht noch Kraft, keines Heiligen Leben, Tugend und Werk Brauch genug dazu sein soll, dass er vom Tode auferstehe, und schlicht aus jedem Manns Vermögen und Verdienst gesamt aus einem einzelnen Mann, der der Welt unbekannt und verrichtet gewesen, dazu auch allerechündlichste und jämmerlichste gestorben ist; dem soll alle Welt die Ehre thun, und ihn allein für sich halten, dass er sei, durch welchen wir alle auferstehen, und kein heiliger Mönch, Leutkürer, ja kein Prophet, Apostel, noch Märtyrer nichts dazu thun noch verdienen, mit allm ihrem Wesen. Das ist ja ein ungeschickter Ring, wenn man ihm will nachdenken. Und hat mich selbst oft wunderbarlich und fremd angesehen, und ist wahrlich ein schwerer Artikel ins Herz zu bringen, wenn ich sehen einen Menschen Tod hintragen und beschauen, dass ich doch mit solchem Herzen und Gedanken soll davon gehen, dass wir werden mit einander wieder auferstehen. Wohin, oder Wodurch? Nicht durch mich, oder um irgend eines Verdienstes willen auf Erden, sondern durch diesen einzigen Willen; und das so gewiss und viel gewisser, denn dass ich da bekehrt soll werden, oder einen Irrthum beschaffen sehe, welches ich doch sehr gewiss weiß und vor Augen habe. Darum heisst eine Predigt für die Christen, und ein Artikel des Glaubens. ... "Lieber hat

auch Gott also wohlgefallen, das du will die Welt bekehren, und seine Leute zu Narren machen, und sein Werk also aufrichten, das er Niemand begreifen soll. Denn wo er so machte, wie ich und du begreifen, und dem normalen, was hätte er für Ehre davon? Oder, was wäre er für ein Gott, der von uns sich lassen lehren, und unserer Weisheit nach richten und wirken sollte? Nun aber macht er also, das seine Weisheit höher bleibe, denn unsere, und wir uns darin müssen gefangen geben, und unser Klügeln lassen, und sagen: Nach meiner Weisheit wäre es nicht sein; aber weil du es sagst, so ist es recht und fein. Wer nun das nicht will, sondern seine Weisheit vor und über Gottes Weisheit setzt, und ihn dar nach richtet, der sehe, was er macht. Wir aber sollen und wollen unsere Klugheit hierunter lassen, über Kühe und Pferde, Bäume, Häuser, Aecker, u. s. magst du klug sein, richten und regieren, wie du wilt, und dabei bleiben; aber unsere Weisheit und ~~Klugheit~~ Regiment sollen wir nicht greifen, als das uns zu hoch und zu fern ist, weil wir unter dem und er über uns ist, als unser Schöpfer und Herr. Darum sollen wir ihn hören, und glauben, was er sagt; also, das er seine Ehre rein behalte, und allein seine Gnade und Gerechtigkeit gelte, ohne allen Ruhm unsere Verdienste. And not only that death & the descent from one man, from another's guilt & from another's merit, but also what is introduced in Rom. 5, 12, as a middle member, that another's guilt is accounted to us as our own guilt & another's righteousness is accounted to us as our own righteousness, belongs to the wonderful, inevitable wisdom of God. And the Church praises & acknowledges this divine wisdom, which is a foolishness to the world, as their faith, in that it sings: "Wie uns man hat ein fremde Schuld in Adam all verhöhet, also hat uns ein fremde Hülfe in Christo all verhöhet; und wie wir all durch Adams Fall sind ewig Gottes gestorben, also hat Gott durch Christus Tod vermerkt, was wir verdorben." Still from the one side light falls into this darkness. God's wisdom & providence, "which is too high & too distant for us," serves for the comfort & salvation of the poor sinners who groan & languish under the curse of Adam. Yes, certainly if the Apostle would speak merely of Adam & the fatal result of the sin of Adam, then we could hardly rest under this discussion, then we must turn with shuddering & terror from this crushing truth. But now, what he says about Adam is for him only a foil, a basis, an introduction for the other thing that he states concerning the second Adam. To be sure, he places before our eyes the abyss of the corruption of Adam; but immediately he turns our vision from thence over to the Antitype & shows us the abyss of the unending, boundless divine mercy. And only for a purpose does he permit us to look into the depth of human corruption, that we might correctly measure the depth & height of the divine grace. The comparison between Adam & Christ teaches & enjoins us to consider & conclude thus: If because of another's guilt God has given us over into death & condemnation, then certainly He shall apply this rule, according to which He charges us with what someone has done, also in the bonam partem, thus He shall certainly ascribe to us another's righteousness, the full obedience of Christ, & place it to our credit. And that is the one way in which we men since the fall of Adam can stand before God & be saved, that we, who are empty & void of all righteous-

210.
5, 20: 21.

near, who can deposit only misdeed, transgression, & sin as our own possession, as our very own performance, envelop ourselves in a strange righteousness, even in Christ's blood & righteousness. Yes, as little as we first draw upon ourselves the condemnation by free decision, τὸ κατὰ πῶμα τὸ ὁ θάνατος, in that the entire human race, from the beginning has been subjected to the power of death because of the sin of Adam, just as little do we merit & bring about through our own conduct the gracious recognition on the side of God, the εἰρήνη ὡς ἡ ζωὴ; this is much rather guaranteed to us from the beginning, & consists simply & alone in the justitia Christi extra nos, pro nobis. To the prize, which our passage, Rom. 5, 12-19, brings to our Christian knowledge, we can also finally reckon the correct Christian contemplation of history. For here there is pictured before our eyes in grandiose broken the history of mankind from the fall of Adam even to the final end. Perhaps looking to some terminus, we can here adapt to ourselves what Luther & others write: "History is a twofold thing, contrary in itself. On the one side stands sin & death, wherein the judgment of God reveals & fulfills itself; on the other side righteousness & life, wherein God's judgment of justification reveals & fulfills itself. Thus the reality is not a unitary one, harmoniously concluded in itself, as the pantheistic manner of thinking conceives it, because it fails to recognize the meaning of sin, but it is a divided reality. And certainly not simply individually, but also generally divided. In the separate parts on the one side there might be much good (that means, apparent good) - the determinative is still sin & death, & on this side there might not be a lack of sin & its results - the determinative is still righteousness & life. No here does it present itself from the fact, that the whole thing is valid before the separate parts; the separate part does not create it, but enters into the scope of the validity of the whole. There there is sin, judgment & death from the beginning by the designated beginning; the separate part is borne into the connection of this mutual possession. Here there is obedience, righteousness of Christ with their result in the judgment of justification of God, & with that the power and the kingdom of life present objectively; the separate part affects only the mutual possession of this prepared salvation, to which it contributes nothing itself, but with which it only concerns itself in participation & appropriation."

To the comparison between Adam & Christ the Apostle still finally adds a remark regarding the Law in

11. 20, 21.

The Apostle had spoken of two economies, the economy of sin & death & the economy of righteousness and life. But there is also an economy of the Law. How does it stand with that? How does the Law conduct itself over against the Law? Paul first calls attention to the fact that the Law has entered in beside, is of subordinate meaning in relation to those two economies. And secondly, that the Law does not help man in anything to righteousness & life as some pharisaically minded Christians might think, but is subservient to the first economy, that it has entered in on the side, so that sin might increase, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ νόμος τὸ κατὰ πῶμα τὸ ὁ θάνατος. "To

$\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu\kappa$ can only be meant in the sense in which the reader must understand it according to v.15 ff, thus: the offence of Adam. This corruptible evil, which was present in the world as the beginning of sin & as the source of the common death, should be increased, that means, to have growth in always more $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu\kappa$. Weiss. "To the transgression of Adam there should be added by the Law new transgressions - the sins in this form." Similarly Philippi & Godet. With the increase of the $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu\kappa$ the sin has increased itself; $\eta\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha$ is the more general concept. On this point, the mounting of sin by the Law, Paul expresses himself more completely later, Rom. 7, 1 ff. But where sin has abounded, thus the Atonement continues, grace has become superabundant, profuse, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, super medium abundavit. We understand it not temporally, but, as usual, local. & do not restrict this expression to the sphere of the people of Israel, but take the statement very generally, in the series: Where the first is the case, there also the second. If the one has taken place, then the other has also happened. If sin has increased, then still much more has grace increased. If, grace has also surpassed the sin which was increased by the Law. And thus through the entering in of the Law the blessed goal of grace has not been disrupted, so that as sin had reigned in death, so also grace reigns by the righteousness to eternal life, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. The Law changes nothing in the status quo, which Paul had placed into the light previously in the parallel between the first & the second Adam, & to which he now again points in short. As he had said previously, that death had reigned by the $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu\kappa$ of the one, v.10, so he says now, v.21, that sin had reigned in & with death, $\epsilon\iota\tau\grave{\omega}\ \epsilon\kappa\upsilon\acute{\rho}\alpha\tau\omega$. In the common reign of death the reign of sin had shown and fulfilled itself, in that even the reign of death was occasioned by sin, namely, the $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu\kappa$ of Adam. This reign of sin unto death has given way, however, to the reign of grace. It is grace which now reigns regally to eternal life, which is the finis ultimus of grace, & certainly by the righteousness which it procures for man & which guarantees eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who with His blood & with His righteousness has earned & merited righteousness & life for the sinners. "The full victorious conclusion $\Delta\iota\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ $\kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ belongs to the entire thought $\eta\ \chi\acute{\rho}\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\Delta\iota\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ to $\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\omicron\nu\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ which he imprints the seal." Weiss.

What the Apostle says in the section, 5, 2-21, concerning the economy of righteousness & life evidently corresponds to that which he had previously taught in general concerning justification, but especially to its content of the first half of the chapter, 5, 1-11. For there he had mentioned not only justification, but nominally had pointed to the future $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ as the certain result of our justification. And so we agree with those expositors who refer $\Delta\iota\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ in v.12 back to vv. 1-11. But since the two halves of the chapter are essentially of the same content &

do not have a certain relationship to one another as cause & effect, as premise & result, therefore we take this $\Delta\iota\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ not in its strict meaning quasi ob causam, but in the sense which Schierlitz points out: " $\Delta\iota\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ = Bezug (for that reason, therefore), more often only constituting the transition to a new cycle of thoughts which however stands in closer connection with the foregoing, Rom. 5, 12. Matt. 23, 34." The meaning of the Apostle is: Causa cum ita sint (Brimm), since it is so, as I have amplified above, namely, that we, of the new

are now reconciled & justified thru Jesus Christ, have the certain hope of eternal life, thus, what I have explained above I put together into the sentence: Even as by Adam's sin it has come to a judgment of death for all men, so by the righteousness of Christ it has come to justification of life for all men. This sentence is the short summary of the second half of the chapter. But in that Paul here presents Christ, in whom we have righteousness & life, as an antitype of Adam, of the originator & source of sin & death, one can also say that he goes back to that which he had previously taught concerning sin & the fatal results, & that thus in & with the section 5, 12-21, from 1, 18 on, he comes to the conclusion of his entire presentation of doctrine, the doctrine of sin & grace.

The Pauline Doctrine of Justification according to Rom. 1-5.

After a presentation of the first five chapters we permit ourselves a derivation, in that we sum up that which the Apostle has previously taught in this Letter, especially from 3, 1 on concerning justification, compile the similar expressions, & bring forward the different groups of thoughts in order, in conformity to the subject matter. Thus we gain an overall picture of the Pauline doctrine of justification for what Paul had otherwise written in his Letters concerning justification has a certain relationship to this presentation of doctrine as an Epitome to a Solida Declaratio.

What Paul understands under justification is clear. The grammatically ascertained meaning of δικαιωσις, δικαιωσθαι, δικαιωσις, resp. δικαιωσιν & εὐδοκία, the synonymous expressions νομιζέσθαι, εἰς δικαιωσιν, the identification of justification, of the accounting of righteousness with the forgiveness of sins, the contract which is designated as ἐκκαθάρσις, καθαρίσθαι, as in general the connection of the sections concerned is more any doubt that it here treats of the judgment of God over man, with the justice imputed to. The meaning of the Roman & Romanizing theologians, the interpretation of the Schleiermachers & Ritschli schools, that Paul means, when he speaks of justification, the justitia imputa, an occurrence in the inner part of man, the moral transformation, the moral disposition of man, is a blow in the right center of the Scriptures. That is therefore the question, how sinful man is justified before God, how he receives a gracious judgment of God.

The answer reads in short: νομιζέσθαι, πιστεῖν δικαιωθεὶς, ἔνδοξον. We therefore hold that man is justified by faith: We are justified before God, we appear before God as righteous ones, God regards us as righteous, πιστεῖν, εἰς πιστέως, thru faith, 3, 28, 30; ἐκ πιστέως, as a result of faith, 3, 28. Faith is accounted to us for righteousness, 4, 3, 5, 9, 22, 24.

The further question is: How far does faith justify? Most modern theologians, even such who take justification as an actus forensis, i.e. in faith, this condition of man, the real causa efficiens of justification,

They suppose that this faith, this condition of man's deliverance & more tend to speak a genuine judgment to man, be it that one takes faith as obedience over against God, as the right, the pleasing disposition, as the fulfillment of the essential duty of the creature over against the Creator, be it that one defines it correctly initially as apprehensio Christi. Even these thoughts Paul excludes intentionally. In 3, 25 he explains $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ more closely by $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$, $\epsilon\pi\gamma\rho\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon$. He places $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\epsilon\pi\gamma\rho\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon$ and $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in contrast to one another. 4, 2. 3, 4, 5. Faith, insofar as it justifies, is to him the reverse of all the works of man, be it an outward work or be it an inner work, the reverse of all his own actions & conduct. When God declares man righteous, He takes into consideration nothing of man's work & conduct.

The vis justificandi of faith lies solely & alone in its object. Faith is a correlative concept, absolutely inconceivable without its object. Faith must have something upon which it holds, upon which it depends. As object of faith there appears in general the grace of God. Especially in the concluding part of his discourse on justification the Apostle praises the grace, the boundless grace of God. 5, 15. 16. 17. 21. The grace of God, His free, undeserved love is the motive, the sole motivation of our justification. We are justified by His grace. 3, 24. We are justified freely, gratuitously, $\epsilon\omega\pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ v. 3, 24. We are justified $\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota$ and not $\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$. 4, 4, 5. And it is faith which takes comfort in the grace of God. Faith, which can introduce no work or merit of its own, holds to that which God gives & promises out of grace. With the $\epsilon\kappa$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ the $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is established and given. 4, 16.

It is the grace of God = the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, it is the grace of God in Christ to which we owe our salvation. 5, 15. Throughout the entire context, 3, 21-5, 21, the precious name of Jesus Christ shows itself. Jesus Christ is the Mediator of this salvation. We read repeatedly: $\Sigma\iota\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\epsilon\pi\gamma\rho\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon$ or $\Sigma\iota\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$. 5, 11, 17. 21. God has proven His incomparable love, His grace in the fact that Christ has died for the godless. 5, 6, 7. God has given Christ into death because of our sins. 4, 25. Thus in Christ we have redemption thru His blood. 3, 24. He is atoned for. 3, 25. We are reconciled to God thru His death. 5, 10. The divine righteousness is granted full satisfaction. 3, 25. 26. Christ & His bloody merit. His perfect obedience, His passive & active obedience (5, 18, 19) is the firm, immortal foundation of our justification. We are justified thru the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. 3, 24. And it is faith which grasps & appropriates Christ and His redemption. We believe in Jesus, in Jesus Christ, 2, 22. 26, in Christ the crucified & risen One, whom God has given into death because of our sins & has then raised Him up again. 4, 24. 25. Christ is the $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\Sigma\iota\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon$. 3, 25.

) Faith lays hold of Christ & His merit. But in & with Christ at the same time the righteousness of Christ. That the which avails before God is present forever in Christ shines out everywhere in the presentation of the Gospel. That has already in that which has said concerning redemption, concerning the atonement & concerning reconciliation. The modernists dissipate & depreciate the concept of the redemption, of the reconciliation in that they present the matter thus, as if with the redemption there is created first the possibility of justification, of the forgiveness of sins, or even

ibility, which then only later, when faith enters in, becomes a reality. No, we are redeemed thru Christ's death & blood, that means: we are actually released from sin, guilt & punishment of sin. This is also for thru Christ's blood, Christ is the expiation by virtue of His blood, which means: sin is covered before the eyes of God, so that God no longer sees them, no longer regards them & accounts them to men. We are reconciled to God by the death of His Son, so that God now has nothing more against us. God was in Christ & reconciled the world to Himself, & He does not account their sins to them. Thus with redemption, atonement & reconciliation there is established & given eo ipso the justification, the non-accounting of sin, & the forgiveness of sin. With His death & blood Christ has not only merited the righteousness which avails before God, the forgiveness of sin, but has also effected & presented these things. That is, as we have shown above, in the communication: ΣΙΚΑΙΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ ΣΙΩ ΤΩΣ ΑΠΟΛΥΤΩΣ ΕΩΣ ΤΩΣ ΕΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ ΤΥ ΕΟΙ. 3, 24. In 5, 210 Paul uses ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ and ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ as synonymous expressions. The glorious raising of Jesus Christ from the dead, however, is the solemn, public declaration of righteousness & atonement, which God has as yet shown over the world of sinners & by which He has sealed the effect of the death of Christ. 4, 24 & 5. For, thru Christ's righteousness, ΣΙΚΑΙΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ, it has already come to justification of life for all men. 5, 18. The many all men, are presented as righteous over thru the obedience of Christ; the obedience, the righteousness of Christ. Like the sin of the disobedience of Adam, has been accounted to all men. 5, 19. The statement has been made & stands firm: God is δ. ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΤΩ ΤΩ ΖΩΕΙ. 4, 5. Thus in Christ for all times, for all men is presented the righteousness which avails before God, in which man can stand before God. And faith takes what is there, what is on hand, & appropriates this righteousness to itself. By faith we become partakers of the promise, of the gracious gift of God, of the gift of righteousness prepared by Christ. 5, 17. By faith we draw the judgment of justification, which God has spoken over the godless in general, upon our persons. 4, 5, 24 & 25. Thus the righteousness which avails before God is α. ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ. ΣΙΩ ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ. ΤΥ ΕΟΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, which becomes our own thru faith, 3, 22, or also α. ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ. ΔΕΟΙ. ΣΙΩ ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ, which becomes our portion as a result of faith, 1, 9, and at the same time α. ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ. ΔΕΟΙ. ΣΙΩ ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ, which settles for faith, which is determined for the fact that man takes it in faith, 1, 17, α. ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ. ΔΕΟΙ which comes upon all who believe, 3, 22, in short, α. ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ. ΠΙΟΤΕΩΣ, 4, 12, a righteousness which has this characteristic, that it is believed, is grasped in faith. And even therefore we are justified by faith or as a result of faith, even therefore God regards him as righteous whose faith is in Jesus, even therefore faith is accounted for righteousness, even therefore faith justifies, because it appropriates to itself the righteousness which avails before God, the judgment of justification of God & thus enters into the personal possession of the same. In faith we take hold of & cling to righteousness, thus we have the righteousness, thus we are justified before God.

But still we must take in addition an essential point. The ΣΙΚΑΙΩ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΕΣ has been and shall be manifested in the Gospel, as is already attested by the Law & the prophets, 1, 17, 3, 21. God has openly presented Christ as the expiation for sin before all the world in the Gospel. 3, 25. The entire treasure, the gift of the grace

of God, namely, Christ, His redemption, the righteousness which avails before God is enclosed in the Word & is brought forth & presented in the Word, by the Word to sinners. The Word is the nearest object of faith. Faith holds itself to the Word, embraces & accepts the Word, & in the Word lays hold of Christ & the righteousness which avails before God. That is the nature of faith, that it looks away from one's own person, from one's own unworthiness & inability goes entirely outside itself, & leans & relies solely & alone on the promise of God, which stands eternally firm outside of it, & which promises it salvation, peace, righteousness, & forgiveness of sins in Christ. 4, 19-21. And even on that account, because faith applies to itself the promise of the Gospel, which points to righteousness & forgiveness of sins, the same is accounted for righteousness. 4, 22.

Lutheran dogmaticians & similarly most modern Lutherans differentiate what regards the object of faith between the bonum justitiae or the meritum Christi and the justificatio resp. justitia coram Deo and teach that only the first, but not also the latter is offered in the Word & laid hold of by faith. The justification itself first comes to pass then, when man has taken Christ's merit in faith. With that the real, deciding judgment of God is detached, from the Word, thus placed in uncertainty & arouses the thought, as if by this act of man, the apprehensio Christi, this act of God, the justificatio, is first called forth. Above all, however, & therefore it here depends on us, this view contradicts directly the above presented connection of thoughts of the Apostle, according to which not only Christ & His redemption, but also the Simul iustus & peccator and the Simul iustus appear as content of the Word & object of faith. On the other hand the real Lutheran type of doctrine, which we find with Luther & the Lutheran theologians of the 16. century & even also in the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, is in all points the true reproduction of the Pauline doctrine of justification. The Apology, in Art. IV, & the Formula of Concord, in Art. III, coordinate completely the grace of God, the merit of Christ, the reconciliation with God, the forgiveness of sins, the righteousness which avails before God, & permit these benefits in general to be comprehended in the Word & to be grasped by faith.

By way of example we quote one of the presentations of the doctrine here referred to from Art. III of the Solida Declaratio of the Formula of Concord, Mueller, Symbl. 2. p. 612. 613. There justification is first of all defined thus: "that poor sinful man is justified before God, that is, absolved & declared free & exempt from all his sins, & from the sentence of well-deserved condemnation, & adopted into sonship & heirship of eternal life, without any merit or worth of our own, also without any preceding, present, or any subsequent works, out of pure grace, because of the sole merit, complete obedience, bitter suffering, death, & resurrection of our Lord Christ alone, whose obedience is reckoned to us for righteousness." (See Trig. p. 919, 920.) And then it reads further: "These treasures are offered us by the Holy Spirit in the promise of the Holy Gospel; & faith alone is the only means by which we lay hold upon, accept, & apply, & appropriate them to ourselves." Thus the previously named blessings, Christ's merit & obedience, justification, absolution adoption to sonship & heirship of eternal life, are offered to us in the Gospel & are applied by faith. Further: "Therefore it is considered & understood to be

the same thing, when Paul says that we are 'justified by faith,' Rom. 3, 27, or that 'faith is counted ours, for righteousness,' Rom. 4, 5, and when he says that we are 'made righteous by the obedience of One,' Rom. 5, 19, or that 'by the righteousness of One justification of faith came to all men,' Rom. 5, 18. For faith justifies, not for this cause & reason that it is so good a work & so fair a virtue, but because it lays hold of and accepts the merit of Christ in the promise of the holy Gospel; for this must be applied & appropriated to us by faith, if we are to be justified thereby. Therefore the righteousness which is imputed to faith or to the believer out of pure grace is the obedience, suffering, & resurrection of Christ, since He has made satisfaction for us to the Law, & paid for (expiated) our sins. For since Christ is not man alone, but God & man in one undivided person, He was as little subject to the Law, because He is the Lord of the Law, as He had to suffer & die as far as His person is concerned. For this reason, then, the obedience, not only in suffering & dying, but also in this, that He in our stead was voluntarily made under the Law, & fulfilled it by this obedience, is imputed to us, for righteousness, or that, on account of this complete obedience, which He rendered His heavenly Father for us, by doing & suffering, in living & dying, God forgives our sins, regards us as godly & righteous, & eternally saves us. This righteousness is offered us by the Holy Ghost through the Gospel & in the sacraments, & is applied, appropriated, & received thru faith whence believers have reconciliation with God, forgiveness of sins, the grace of God, worship, & heirship of eternal life. Thus according to this we are justified by faith or, faith is accounted to us for righteousness not because of the fact that it is such a good work & a fine merit, but because "it lays hold of & accepts the merit of Christ in the promise of the holy Gospel." To the merit of Christ, however, which faith lays hold of in the promise of the Gospel, belongs the fact that according to Rom. 5 we are justified by the obedience of the one Mediator, Christ, that by the righteousness of One justification of life has come upon all men, or, that God "forgives our sins & regards us as godly & righteous" because of the complete obedience of Christ, which He rendered to God in life & death. This righteousness, "hanc justitiam, namely, that 'God forgives our sins and regards us as godly & righteous,' thru the righteousness which avails before God & which is effected thru the obedience of Christ is present before the Word & faith, is then offered to us by the Gospel & applied, appropriated & received by faith. Therefore the believers have, unde habent, reconciliation with God, forgiveness of sins, & God's grace. Because they have applied to themselves & accepted this righteousness, therefore they now have that which they have applied to themselves, in one word, "the righteousness," & thus appear before God as righteous.

The same modus rerum comes to us in the following short statements of our Confessions: *Remissio peccatorum et justificatio fide apprehenditur. Conf. Aug. Art. VI. Mueller, Symbr. B., p. 40. Sed scirent, fide in Christum apprehendi gratiam et remissionem peccatorum et justificationem. Conf. Aug. Art. VII. Mueller, p. 45. Evangelium omnes arguit, quod sint sub peccato, quod omnes sint rei aeternae irae et mortis, et offert propter Christum remissionem peccatorum et justificationem, quae fide recipitur. Synologie, Art. II. Mueller, p. 98. Justificatio tantum est res gratiae promissa propter Christum, quare sola fide semper coram Deo accipitur. Synologie, Mueller, p. 123. 'We believe, teach &*

confess that faith alone is the means & instrument whereby we lay hold of Christ, & thus in Christ of that righteousness which avails before God." Form. Conc. Ger. Epitome Mueller, p. 528 (Trig. p. 993).

We still add the exposition of Luther on Gen. 15: 6: "Concerning the word 'charchab', which we have rendered in the German as 'zurechnen', I do not fight greatly, whether it is read 'zurechnen' or 'gedenken', it amounts to the same thing. For thus the divine majesty thinks of me, that I am righteous, that my sins are forgiven me, that I am released & free of eternal death, & I receive & lay hold of such thoughts of God concerning me with thanksgiving in faith, therefore I am really righteous, not by my own works, but by the faith wherewith I lay hold of and grasp God's thoughts. For God's thoughts are truth, which deceive & fail no one; therefore when I lay hold of them with my conscience & steadfast thoughts, not with an unconscious & doubting false opinion, then I am justified. For faith is a steadfast & certain thought or confidence of God that thru Christ He is gracious and that for Christ's sake He has thought of us, how we might have peace, not how He is angry with us & punishes us. For these two things, God's thoughts & promise & faith, by which I lay hold of God's promise, belong together." M. S. E. d. I, 943-4. According to Luther it does not conduct itself here thus, that man believes & God thereafter considers that he is righteous, but turned around thus, that the divine majesty thinks of me, that I am righteous, that my sins are forgiven, & that I then lay hold of & grasp these thoughts of God with my thoughts in faith; when I do that then I am truly justified.

In this Pauline, genuinely Lutheran doctrine of justification the Evangelical Synodical Conference of North America confesse. We quote a passage from the Synodical Conference Proceedings of 1892, which treats of the general justification but which particularly sets into the right light its relationship of faith to justification and guarantees the independence of the justifying judgment of God from all human conduct. "This doctrine namely the doctrine of the general justification is directly expressed in the passage, Rom. 5: 12, and it is therefore not only a biblical doctrine but also a biblical expression, that the justification of life has come over all men. Only a Latinistic exegesis can explain this passage for the fact that only the elect are justified. Also orthodox ancient theologians of our Church therefore speak of the general justification merited & offered to all. Gerhard says that Christ's resurrection is the general absolution; however, absolution is nothing else than justification. In Christ even the sinful world is condemned to death & in His resurrection this world has been declared justified. Now when a pastor absolves, then he distributes a treasure which is already on hand, namely, the already merited forgiveness of sins. If the treasure were not at hand, then no pastor could absolve; yes, then we could also not speak of the justification of the sinner by faith, for to believe means to take what is there. Now if the world were not already justified, then to believe must mean to fulfill a work for justification. However, the entire preaching of the Gospel is a message of God of a righteousness which is already earned by Him & is there for everyone. Therefore the statement that in Christ the justification of the entire world has already taken place, has not only nothing deceitful, but it is also very biblical. Those who say that God has made the entire world righteous, but has not declared it righteous, thereby again deny essentially the entire justification, for the declaration of

righteousness of the Father is not to be separated from the justification of the Son, since He has raised Christ from the dead. Certainly that does not help any man to the possession of righteousness & salvation, when he does not accept the justification. When the king pardons a company of criminals, then on his part of the king they are all released from guilt & punishment, but whoever does not accept the pardon from him must pay further for his guilt; even so does it also take place with sinners in justification, which has come about thru Christ's death & resurrection. Yes, if God had not written & sealed the letter of pardon, then we preachers would be liars & deceivers of the people, when we say to you: Only believe, then you are justified; but now God has ratified the letter of grace for sinners by the resurrection of His Son & has furnished it with His divine seal, therefore we can preach comfortingly: The world is justified, the world is reconciled with God; which latter expression one would also dare not use, if the former would not be true."

The doctrine of justification, as Paul submits it, leads finally to a mystery, which we cannot clear up. The Apostle testifies on the one hand that the justification of life has come over all men, on the other hand, that all the world is guilty & punishable before God, *Rom. 3, 19*. That does not contradict itself, it is a double manner of contemplation of the same object. The first time the world is considered in Christ, the other time outside of Christ. Outside of Christ God is angry at the sinners, in Christ God looks upon the sinful world with eyes of pleasure. The one is a judgment of His law, the other a judgment of His love over sinful mankind. But we can certainly not bring together into one in our thoughts this double manner of contemplation. We cannot grasp & understand & explain how both of these things together take place in God, that outside of Christ He accounts to the world their sins & that in Christ He has absolved the world from their sins. In the quoted Synodical Conference Proceedings it reads: "One must differentiate between two ways how God looks upon man. When God regards the world in Christ, His Son, then He regards them with the deepest love; but when He regards the world outside of Christ, then He cannot look at them any other way than with burning anger. ... Accordingly God does two things, He is angered over the sinners & at the same time He loves them so greatly that He gave His only begotten Son for them. ... Still there lies here an inexpressible & unfathomable mystery. In God there are no agitations as in us men, who are now minded one way, now another, who now have these feelings, now those. Of Him it is written: Thou remainest as Thou art. With His essence one thing is everything that God thinks & wills. ... Now there is a further way. We find in God's Word two things, which we cannot ~~neg~~ rhyme, therefore we leave both stand and believe both, just as it reads." But we must still add something to this. The object of the redemption & justification which has taken place thru Christ is the entire sinful mankind, nevertheless mankind as looking away from the manner in which the individual man places himself over against Christ & the Gospel. The justification of all has likewise taken place in the dark. When God thru Christ reconciled the world to Himself & absolved them of their sins, the world still knew nothing thereof. To the counsel of the salvation of God, however, belonged also the other part, that thru the Gospel God manifested & made known to man Christ, Christ's work & blessing, so that men might recognize them & appropriate them to themselves in faith. And now whoever believes, wherever in

Faith accepts the Gospel & in the Gospel Christ & in Christ the righteousness which avails before God is justified, he thereby passes from the status peccati et irae into the status gratiae, into the condition of righteousness, &c, and is a child of pleasure to which no anger clings any more. And so the believer, in whom the redemption & justification come to their purpose & goal & remain fixed, are the redeemed of the Lord. Isa. 35:10; & 42. On the other hand, whoever does not believe, whoever rejects the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ, thereby for his own person sets aside the power & effect of God's grace & Christ's redemption & forgiveness, & Be 1st, for whom Christ has died in vain, Gal. 2, 21; with such unbelief he again places in force & effect the forgiven sin, the obliterated guilt, & is now doubly a child of wrath & condemnation.

Justification, the righteousness which avails before God, is a preliminary condition, the most certain guarantee of the future salvation, of the outpouring, of the heavenly inheritance. 1, 10, 17; 4, 13-16; 5, 5-10. It has come to justification of life for all men. Salvation has been merited & prepared by Christ for all men & thereby awarded to all, so that they are justified. But only those who are partakers of the gift of righteousness through faith shall actually reign with Christ in life in the future.

Chapter II.

6, 1-14. Sanctification as a Proof of the Condition of the Christians.

6, 1, 2.

The Apostle here begins the discussion anew, in that he writes: *τί οὖν ἐπορεύμεν*; *Proiter autem τί οὖν ἐπορεύμεν*; non tibi tantummodo, ubi quid jam dixere aut effari possit aliquis exquirat, novum etiam tum, quum quid jam in disputando dixere h. e. ex antegressis colligere possit aliquis percontatur. Ubi formula quid ergo est? quid ergo inde efficietur? notat. Sic haec loco, ubi percontationem quid igitur dicemus (c. superioribus eruemus)? nova et quae sui juris sit interrogatio eripit: Num adhaereamus? -? Fritzschel thus: What now presents itself from the previous remarks, from the statement that where sin has abounded, grace has become superabundant? 5, 20, 21. In general, what follows from the doctrine of grace? Something like this, that we continue in sin, so that grace might increase itself, so that God might receive so much a richer opportunity to manifest His grace, to forgive sin? The conjunctive *ἐπεὶ οὖν* *ἐπορεύμεν*, which is more accredited than the future *ἐπιμενεοῦμεν*, is the so-called conjunctiva deliberativa. That is a conclusion which the opponents of the

) Christians drew from the Christian doctrine. They repeated after the Christians, as we have read this in 3, 8, that they taught thus & also operated according to this maxim: Let us do evil, that good might come out of it. And similarly in later times the Christian doctrine of justification by grace has been misinterpreted & perverted, as if it granted sin support, as if it undermined true morality. The Christians themselves rejected this conclusion with indignation & said with Paul: *μη γένοιτο*, "daeneis forme," "God forbid." Only the enemy does not know

220.
6, 1, 2.

grace could conclude & speak thus. Only he who has somewhat recognized & experienced what grace is, hates & avoids sin, & thanks God for His grace, & sin is dead. The Christians, who have become partakers of the grace of God thru faith, confess: "How should, how can we, who are dead to sin, henceforth still live unto sin? That is quite impossible for us." In the expression $\Sigma\gamma\omicron\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ Frutgache remarks: $\Sigma\gamma\omicron\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ where $\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ to live & more, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ as similitudine intentionis studium rei dicere, rei vehementer studere & clar. at. ad Rom 9, 26 : Vivax , inquis, in litteris, and Philippus: "To live in sin = to hold down the intercourse of life, the relationship, the connection with it. Similarly $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\iota\upsilon\varsigma$, 1 Cor. 4, 2; Eph. 4, 19. $\text{H}\alpha\lambda\ \pi\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is the outward appearance of the $\Sigma\gamma\omicron\upsilon$, which predominately designates the inner spiritual intercourse, cf. Col. 3, 7; Gal. 5, 25."

The double question: their denial, with which the Epistle begins the new section of the letter already lets it be seen significantly what he now has in view. After he had presented the doctrine of sin & of grace, he now comes to speak of the life & conduct of the Christian, of sanctification as the necessary result of justification & of justifying faith. That is the content of the third principle part of the letter, chap. 6-8, as this is almost unanimously agreed by ancient & modern commentators. Tertius huius epistolae pars est principalis propositio capituli, agens de veritate vitae et studio honorum operum. Nam tractatus hactenus et explicatus deest in partibus, quae sunt, homines esse peccatores, et sola fide justificari, recte accedit ad tertium, cum aliquot argumentis confirmat eam declarationem, quae fidei iustitiam debent pie mirari.

That the Christians continue in sin, henceforth still live in sin, ^{no more} in sin, is thereby excluded, that they are dead to sin. The emphasis lies upon the $\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ and $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. That would not say, as some have variously taken it, that we have no need sin, have broken off intercourse, communion with sin. If the meaning would be that in case we would still live in sin, this latter condition would contradict our former condition. But the Epistle, when he denies that we continue in sin, live in sin, refers particularly to the conduct of the Christian, which had begun with the Christian condition, & brings into prominence the fact that the conduct of the Christian is determined by the fact that they are dead to sin. "With $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\tau\iota\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ there is not something meant which the Christians have done, but something which has ceased with them... the event with which the life ceases, one to be determined by the reference to sin." Hofmann. That we are dead to sin is a similar expression, as when it says that the Christians are dead to the Law, 2, 4; Gal. 3, 19. In this turn of expression sin, like the Law, appears as a power which determines, rules the life, the conduct of man. The Christians are dead to sin, as the Law, that is, they have become, free from that drawing to sin, to the Law, their life is now no longer ordered & regulated by sin, by the Law, as it was previously. We are dead to sin; that means in other words: we are freed from the power, might, lordship, from the curse & control of sin. Mortuum est peccatum ut a peccati dominio et oppressione liberatum esse, non autem ut plane a peccato ipso se removere libenter. Salvo. "Es elinervado from sin, as offered by Christ & as secured by the believer; in yet more distinct sense from its power, but from its power." Hodge. And such elinervado from the power & dominion of...

222.
6, 3 -11.

the other. God has ordained & established these two means of grace, the Gospel & Baptism, Word & Sacrament. And the mention of Baptism is certainly in place there, where the Christians are reminded of the beginning of their state of Christianity. For by Baptism we have become Christians. Baptism is the sacrament, initiation. Christ had commanded His disciples in Matt. 28:18-20 to make disciples of, $\alpha\gamma\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, all nations, thereby, that they baptize them, $\βαπτίζετε$, etc. According to Acts 2:41 those Jews & converts to Judaism, who were baptized on Pentecost, were thereby added to the Church. That was the beginning of the first Christian congregation in Jerusalem. The text, when he writes $\text{ἐσοῦντες βαπτιστέοντες ἐν ὕδατι ἰν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ}$, has in mind first of all such Christians who were baptized as adults. He himself had received Baptism in his mature age & most of the members of the Roman congregation had formerly been Gentiles & Jews. The baptism of adults follows the proclamation of the Gospel. In the command of Christ to baptize, Matt. 28:18 ff., Baptism & teaching are combined with one another. On Pentecost those Jews & converts to Judaism were baptized, who previously had heard the sermon of Peter concerning Christ & had received it with joy. Acts 2:41. The adults, those who are of age who can understand human speech & doctrine are added into connection with Christ, Christ's death & resurrection thru the Word, & with them Baptism is the seal & confirmation of the promise of grace of the Gospel. Still since the instruction preceding baptism first of all aims at Baptism & Christ has expressly ordained Baptism as a sacrament, initiation, nevertheless with full right Paul considers designates Baptism as a beginning of the Christian state & a means of union with Christ, in that he combines instruction in Baptism & Baptism into one thought. The children & the immature, on the other hand, who are still not able to grasp the word—and there were also baptized children already everywhere in the first Christian congregation—entered into the communion with Christ & His death solely by Baptism, with the baptismal act itself. We remarked above on v. 2 that we, since we became Christians when we became believers, are dead to sin. The becoming Christians falls together with the becoming believers. The Scripture throws places the becoming believers, $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$, as the beginning of the state of a Christian. But that does not contradict that which Paul writes in our passage regarding Baptism. According to the command of Baptism of Christ Baptism & faith are connected with one another. "He that believeth & is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16:16. In Gal. 3:26, 27 it reads: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Thus Baptism & faith we have put on Christ, we have entered into communion with Christ & have thereby become the children of God. In our passage the $\text{ἐσοῦντες βαπτιστέοντες ἐν ὕδατι ἰν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ}$ includes faith itself. For the relationship, the communion with Christ which is designated with $\text{ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ}$ is not possible, is not conceivable without faith. Faith is certainly nothing else than personal contact with Christ. Love and sacrament are media. ἐν τῷ ὕδατι and have as a correlate, faith as a medium $\text{ἰν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ}$. Faith, which is brought about among adults by the Word, among children in the baptismal act, takes & applies to itself, that

which God presents & imparts in Word & Sacrament - Christ & the fruits of His death: whoever believes this becomes a partaker of Christ & His redemption & is thus free & liberated from sin not only from the guilt & punishment, but also from the power & bonds of sin.

When the Epistle continues in v. 4: "So sind wir nun mit ihm begraben durch die Taufe in den Tod, auf dass, gleichwie Christus auferweckt worden ist von den Toten durch die Herrlichkeit des Vaters, also auch wir in Neuheit des Lebens wandeln" ("Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life") - so folgt er nicht aus dem Tode Christi, der vorher erwähnt war, dessen Begräbnis, aus unserer Beteiligungs an Christi Tod unsere Beteiligungs an Christi Auferstehung, but the emphasis lies on the purpose clause - its confirmation in v. 5, on the statement of the resurrection of Christ & our sharing in Christ's resurrection. In this entire section these two parts, Christ's death & Christ's resurrection, our sharing in Christ's death & Christ's resurrection, are placed over against one another. Originally, only here, in v. 4, is mention made of the burial. The thought that we are baptized into Christ's death v. 3, one can also express thus, that in Baptism we have died with Christ, that we have died in a spiritual manner. In Baptism we Christians have experienced a dying, since we have died to sin, have been taken from the power of sin.

And that is a dying with Christ, in that we have been baptized into the death of Christ & have thus become partakers of the death of Christ & the fruits of the same. But this thought is again taken up in v. 4, only in another, stronger form, with αὐτῷ, "inasmuch as", "therefore". It reads now: "Wir sind mit Christo durch die Taufe begraben in den Tod" ("we are buried with him by baptism into death"). εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὸν θάνατον. They often combine the words εἰς τὸν θάνατον with εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ θανάτου, & therefore the most part understand under the θάνατον the death of Christ. But then the αὐτῷ could not be lacking behind τὸν θάνατον. Without αὐτῷ the words give only the meaning that we are baptized, buried in the death, that spiritual death, which corresponds to the death of Christ. That would still be no clear explanation, that we are buried in our own death, & the εἰς behind τοῦ θανάτου, then has, as Hofmann particularly calls attention to the fact, a different meaning than the double εἰς behind the double εἰς τὸν θάνατον in v. 3. Much rather with Hofmann, Fehrdt & others we refer εἰς τὸν θάνατον to εὐεταφύμεν and take θάνατον as a conclusion of death. "To be buried into death" is only a stronger expression for "to die." Whoever is buried now belongs to the dead. We are dead to sin & are really, entirely dead for sin. The chain which bound us to sin is completely cut loose. That is the meaning. And that therefore, because through Baptism we have died & been buried with Christ -

Have thus become partakers of the death & burial of Christ. Christ's burial was also only a conclusion of His suffering & death, a proof & confirmation of His death. When Christ lay in the grave, there He appeared before the whole world as one of the dead. Now, however, that we have died & been buried with Christ has the purpose, which was hereby the aim of God, that, as Christ has been raised from the dead, so also we should walk in newness of life, ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς. That we should walk in newness of life or in a new life - that was

the finis ultimus. That, however, presupposes that we stand in a new life. From the time of our Baptism we Christians stand in a new life. And this has its equality in the new life to which Christ has been raised. Christ has risen from the dead to the glory of God. God's glory or majesty is the epitome of all divine attributes & perfection. Here especially we have to think of the omnipotence of God. With His resurrection, however, Christ has entered into a new life. And to that corresponds the new life in which the baptized Christians stand. That is the tertium comparationis, nothing else. The ἐκ νεκρῶν, which applies to the resurrection of Christ, has no correlate in the parallel. In other connections, for example, ἐφ. 2, 1 ff., Paul states that we Christians are raised from the dead with Christ. Therefore with the death from which we are raised he means the spiritual, moral death, i.e., the condition when we were dead in sin, entangled completely in sin & drowned in sin. Out of this condition we have come, which we have overcome, since we have been raised in a spiritual manner. The spiritual dying on the other hand, of which Paul speaks in Rom., is an entirely different thing than what which one generally according to ἐφ. 2 calls the spiritual death, which is the opposite of entanglement in sin, of the slavery of sin, of the service of sin, namely deliverance from the bonds of sin. And of that it cannot be said in a reasonable manner that we have been raised up therefrom. That we are dead to sin is the negative side, that we stand in a new life is the positive side of sanctification.

How it has come with us to this new life is stated in the following sentence: ὅτι ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ νεκρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκαταβήκαμεν, οὕτως ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ ζῳῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκαταβήκαμεν ("for if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection"). 1. Cor. 6, 14. Ἐπὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ὡς ἐν τῷ νεκρῷ, οὕτως ὡς ἐν τῷ ζῳῷ. We are entwined, namely in Beitritt, for ἐκ νεκρῶν can mean only this here, with the ἐκ νεκρῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, namely, of Christ. That can only mean that we are grown together with the death of Christ itself, have entered into the closest connection with it, not: without our spiritual dying. For a man never grows together with himself, but always with another person. Just because the death of Christ has an equality in our spiritual dying, therefore the Apostle here calls the same ἐκ νεκρῶν which is nothing which is like or similar to another thing. ὁμοιωσις is to be taken here concretely in the sense of image, similitude, and τοῦ Χριστοῦ as a genitive of apposition. The protasis in 1. Cor. 6, 14 therefore says essentially the same thing as the foregoing sentence, that we are baptized into the death of Christ, that by baptism we are buried with Christ in death. From this fact, however, there follows the other, upon that lies the emphasis, that we are also grown together with the resurrection of Christ. In the apostrophe in 1. Cor. 6, 15 there is to be supplied τοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν before τῷ ζῳῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἐκ νεκρῶν before ἐκ νεκρῶν out of the protasis. The future ἐκ νεκρῶν is the futurum logicum and designates that which from this standpoint of our spiritual death of the dying with Christ is in the future, in reality, like in the past. For in the entire section, 1. Cor. 6, 14-17, Paul points back to that which we have experienced in our Baptism. Thus in our Baptism we have also grown together with the resurrection of Christ, which is likewise a similitude of our spiritual resurrection, which necessarily follows.

out of the being grown together with His death. With Christ death & resurrection hang closely together. Christ is the crucified & risen one. Thus whoever has a share in His death also has a share in His resurrection. On the preceding, in v. 4, it was only stated that the new life in which we Christians stand has an equality (ὡς ἐν) with the resurrection of Christ. That lies also in the Epiphany. But here, in v. 5, it is now still added that this new life of ours springs & flows from the resurrection of Christ. In Baptism we have received a share in the resurrection of Christ & the new life, into which Christ has entered with His resurrection. In Baptism the new life of Christ, the resurrection life of Christ is implanted in us, therefore we are flesh of His flesh, bone of His bone, Eph. 5, 30. And now we are born again to a new life, therefore without has come to the new life in which we Christians now stand & walk.

In v. 6 it reads further: τὸ αὐτὸ ζήσαντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐκσταυρώσθῃ, etc., "indem wir da wachen, dass unverändert Mensch mit gekreuzigt ist, etc." "knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him," etc.). Into the τὸ αὐτὸ ζήσαντες too much is added, when, as, for example, Hofmann, Schardt, Philippi & Meyer, take it as "empirical perception" & even therein see the development of the discourse, that the Apostle, who had previously taught & spoken of objectively, now speaks of that which is known to the Christians from his own experience. The τὸ αὐτὸ ζήσαντες runs parallel to the ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε in v. 3, as well as to the εἰ δέ ἐστε, in v. 8. The entire section, vv. 3-11, contains a reminder. The Apostle reminds the Christians of that which they know, which they had already learned, when they became Christians. The participial clause, τὸ αὐτὸ ζήσαντες, ὅτι etc., brings a closer explanation & further prosecution of that which was said previously. We Christians now & should now & consider that our old man is crucified with Him. The παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, the old man is the sinful self. ... He is looked upon as παλαιὸς from the standpoint of the ἀναγέννησις, of the παλιγγενεσία (John 3, 3; Tit. 3, 5), the former, past man, which is contrasted to the ἀνθρώπος νεός, which is created by the regeneration, to the καλὸς, or the καὶνὴ κτίσις, Eph. 4, 24; Col. 3, 9, 10; 1 Cor. 5, 7. The expression παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος thus contains an expropriation not of the former way of acting (in Col. 3, 9 the παρὰ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ is differentiated from the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος himself), but of the former (sinful) condition or basic tendency of the entire life. "Philippi. The old man is the sinful, corrupt habitus of the man, the condition & manner of disposition which is established by the sinful regeneration & birth, out of which come forth all sinful desires, thoughts & motions of his will, and this old man is now crucified, crucified with Christ, namely, in Baptism, in that & by Baptism we have become partakers of Christ's death by crucifixion & the fruits of His name. The old Adam is drowned, not to rise in Baptism, which would say that it has lost all power over us. But that has happened to this purpose: ἵνα καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, "damit der Leib der Sünde unserer Wirkksamkeit gänzlich würde". That the body of sins might be destroyed", and this purpose is also realized among baptized Christians. τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is not sins as an organism (Philippi & others), & τῆς ἁμαρτίας thus is not the genitive of an action, but τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the genitive of the characteristic attribute and τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ἁμαρτίας evidently

in the same as τὸ ἐν τῷ σώματι, v. 11, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σαρκὸς τοῦ 24 thus the real body, & the same is called the body of sin or, as Luther has translated it, "does sin like a body," not as if the body were the real location or even the source of sin, but as the organ or instrument of sin (body). Sin or the old man seeks thru the medium of the body & the members of the body to fulfill its evil lusts & also does fulfill them in natural man. Among the baptized Christians, on the other hand, the body of sin is put out of activity. Καταργη, ἐξηρα is to be taken here in its original, real meaning, inertness, inactivity, reddis (Krimm). Where the old man is crucified, the power of sin is broken, therefore also the body of sin the body even as such, as an instrument, as an organ of sin is put out of power & activity. From that it follows, that that is the purpose of disempowering of the body of sin & the final, ultimate purpose of the crucifixion of the old man: τὸ ὑποκρίναι τοῦ σώματος τοῦ σαρκὸς τῆς ἁμαρτίας. That is: the body will cease to serve sin as previously. And now Baptism has put us in the position, for then it no longer serves sin, because the old man is put to death & no longer rules the body.

That we no longer need to serve sin is confirmed in v. 2 by the general axiom: "Wer gestorben ist, der ist los von Sünde!" "For he that is dead is freed from sin!" ὁ ἀποθνήσκων δεδικαιώται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, which states essentially the same thing as that the old man is crucified, that we are dead to sin. With S. 121: 1. 2. 3. here is not meant his absolution from the guilt of sin, since the Crucifixion here no longer is. Identification in the solemn sense of the word, as the same supposition & foundation, for this S. 121: 1. 2. 3. is what Paul here has in mind. In the entire section, v. 3-11, the discussion is concerning the release from sin itself, from the power & dominion of sin. The power which sin has over man can, however, also be considered as a claim, a claim of title, which sin has applied against man. Sin, the mistress, places upon man a claim conceived & born in sin the demand that he must serve her. And now whoever has died is released from sin, from this S. 121, has come out from the jurisdiction of sin. That is a general truth, which refers first of all to physical death. So also Meyer, Weiss, Hofmann, Kodel. Whoever has died in a bodily manner is taken away thereby from the strict order, from the legal sphere of sin. For sin's the service of sin falls into this earthly life. With death the judgment enters in. And after death the wages of sin shall be paid to the servants of sin; there shall man be rewarded for what he has done in his physical life. This general axiom, however, applies also to the moral death, of which the entire section treats, which we Christians have experienced in our Baptism. We have died with Christ, our old man is crucified with Christ, & thus sin is no longer over us & ought no more, & we no longer need to serve & obey sin. Nisi jam in eum (qui non vivit et) vivamus in peccato, ut non jam sit debitor, s. B. 12. Bengel. That we no longer need to serve sin as previously, that this is possible for us even by the death experienced in Baptism, by the crucifixion of the old man - and this is the emphasis in the two verses, v. 5 & 11, in which the previous statements are repeated. The final clause τὸ ὑποκρίναι τοῦ σώματος τοῦ σαρκὸς τῆς ἁμαρτίας marks the continuation of the thought.

Out of our participation in the death of Christ the Apostle here again also concludes our participation

in the life of Christ: "Wenn wir aber mit Christo gestorben sind, so glauben wir, dass wir auch mit ihm leben werden" ("Now as we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him"). 1. v. 8.

The future οὐ σὺ γινώσκεις we understand even as the expressions τὸ ὁμοιωματὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως; οὐ μὲν οὖτοι ἔσονται θά, 1. 5. Here, however, that earlier statement is not only simply repeated but explains more fully what kind of a new life that is in which we Christians stand from our Baptism: "wird auferweckt, dass Christus, aufgeweckt von den Todten, nicht mehr stirbt, der Tod ist über ihm nicht mehr Herr. Denn wer er gestorben ist, ist er der Sünde gestorben ein für allemal; was er aber lebt, das lebt er, Gott. Also auch ihr habet dafür, dass ihr der Sünde todt seid, dagegen Gott lebt in Christo Jesu, unserem Herrn." ("Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Therefore reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God, thru Jesus Christ our Lord"). 1. v. 8. It is kind of a statement concerning Christ, how this present life is secured & disposed; something similar then also applies to us, because in Baptism we have become partakers of the resurrection of Christ. Christ, having been raised from the dead, dieth no more, death no longer has dominion over him. With the life into which Christ has entered with His resurrection the situation is quite different, from His former life on earth which was subject to death & had

found its conclusion with His death & burial. Now the present life of Christ as disposed is stated by the sentence where second part has the stress: "For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." The expression οὐ ἄν ἔθαρ εἰς τὸ θεοῦ ἵνα ἔθαρ εἰς τὸ θεοῦ ἵνα ἔθαρ εἰς τὸ θεοῦ. Concerning the death of Christ it applies that He is dead to sin. Thus it reads of Christ: τὸ ὁμοιωματὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, then it is to be taken over as when it is said of us ἀποθνήσκω τῷ ἁμαρτίᾳ, 1. 2. The clause τὸ ὁμοιωματὶ is here as there the clause of relation. Christ also with His death has gone free in relation to sin. Only that He has a different relationship to sin than we have. His former life of Christ, which closed with His death, was also determined & ruled by sin, namely, the strange sin, the sin of mankind, which He had taken upon Himself. What Christ had done, experienced, suffered in the days of His flesh applied to sin, served the one purpose, to expiate, to atone for, & to abolish the sin of mankind. This purpose has been fulfilled with His death. Sin has now once & for all been expiated, abolished & put away. Therefore also for us by virtue of our Baptism into the death of Christ sin has been put away. And so for Christ this former relationship to sin has ceased with His death. Now & to all eternity He has nothing more to do with sin. In that He now lives, since He has been raised from the dead, He lives to God. His present life has only relationship to God, is determined

solely of God, is turned to God. The divine nature & glory has now taken normal life. With His resurrection He has entered into the status glorioe, the state of glorification. Vivit deo, vivit in deo gloriose, divini gloriae plenam. Bengel. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God thru Jesus Christ our Lord." Thus, like as Christ, we Christians are also dead to sin & alive unto God; we find ourselves now in a divine existence & life, because the new life of Christ has been im-

228.
6, 12-14.

planted in us by Baptism. Only that the $\delta\gamma\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ^{with} $\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ Christ applies to the physical condition of His natural life, with us, on the other hand, it applies to the ethical condition of our personal life. Hoffmann since His resurrection Christ lives entirely to God, in that respect, also according to His body; since our Baptism we live to God according to the inward man. The new life of regeneration is converted to God. The new man which is created in Baptism is turned to God, rejoices in God, thinks, speaks, loves, with only what is of God. Thus we now live to God with Christ at the same time "through Jesus Christ our Lord." We live in the communion of Christ & thus our lives are concluded with Christ in God.

The last statement, 11, contains at the same time a short recapitulation of the entire amplification in vv. 3-10. "Therefore we Christians should hold concerning ourselves, $\delta\epsilon\gamma\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ that we are dead to sin and alive to God." Thus we should judge concerning ourselves, for the $\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ reality of $\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ makes itself sensible in a different manner. Luthereth. Often we trace very little of the divine nature, on the other hand, sin of $\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ makes itself still very perceptible in us; but therefore we should simply believe that which God's Word says to us, that we are free from sin, that we really conceal in ourselves a divine life. It is etiam $\gamma\alpha\rho$ presented by God, this which we have not done but have received in Baptism, is, as already remarked above, the most inner source of sanctification. That is the source out of which the real Christian conduct flows, this is the foundation upon which the Apostle now builds his admonition to a real Christian conduct.

Vv. 12-14.

On the basis of the foregoing reminds the Apostle now and admonishes, v. 12: $\mathcal{M}\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\iota\gamma\iota\varsigma$ "Es soll nun die Hünde nicht herreichen in euren sterblichen Leibe." "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body." Dramatically the admonition is directed to sin, according to the sense it is directed to the Christians. The meaning is that the Christians should no longer permit sin to reign over them. That presupposes that sin is still present in them, although it has lost & given over its powers to be their mistress. They should not concede dominion to sin, no longer here forth serve sin. Luther paraphrases: "Nicht, die sünd' ist noch in der Leibe, welche sie nicht folgen." The Christians should not permit sin to reign in their mortal body. The $\delta\gamma\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ cannot possibly mean the body together with the soul, as Philippi asserts according to several ancient expositors, the whole man according to body & soul, inasmuch as it is still not regenerated. Paul writes in 2, 1 that God shall one day quicken our mortal bodies from the dead. But it is only the body which dies & is raised again on the last day. The $\delta\gamma\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\delta\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ simply gives the sphere in which the forbidden dominion would take place. Meyer. The body appears here also not as the seat sitting or the source of the sin, but as the instrument through which sin, when it reigns in man, fulfills its will. The Apostle

dition of being dead in sin & throwing as it is described in Eph. 2:11. Thus here we have to think of that being dead, which we usually call the spiritual death. What the apostle admonishes concerning, is the reign of sin, which the Christians should prevent, lies close to this thought. Those who are now Christians formerly, when they were still Gentiles, stood under the dominion of sin & walked in all sorts of vices, & they were spiritually dead. And out of this death they have now become alive & now as such they should present themselves to God, commend themselves to God with body & soul, with heart, mind & thoughts. That takes place above all in daily prayer. The apostle $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\rho\gamma\omega\tau\epsilon$ designates what they should constantly do. And at the same time they should present their members as instruments of righteousness, — and that is here the righteousness of life, — for the disposal of body. Hands, feet, eyes, ears, tongue, etc., should be incessantly in the service & praise of God. And that no Christian does, when he carries out his work, which God has ordained for him here below.

Now, however, as already remarked, in order to understand & evaluate this double admonition correctly, one must actually hold oneself faithfully to the connection of the same with the preceding reminder. The correct Christian conduct follows of itself from the Christian conditions, from that which the Christians have experienced in their Baptism & possess, from the time of their Baptism. The apostle impresses upon the Christians, & that Christian preachers should also speak to their Christians: You have died to sin, are dead to sin; Christ with His death has redeemed you from sin, from the power & dominion of sin, & you have become partakers of His redemption by Baptism, the power of sin in you has been broken; your old man is crucified; the bond which bound you to sin has been broken; you are free, inwardly free, actually free from sin; you no longer need to serve sin, now, therefore, no longer serve sin; let not sin rule over you again and prove it indeed, that you are free from sin. You are raised with Christ, in Baptism you have become partakers of the resurrection life of Christ, therefore, a new, spiritual, divine life has been implanted in you, you actually stand in a new life, now, therefore, also manifest this new life, use & exercise the powers which are in you, & live to serve God with body & soul. By such admonition, which is thus motivated, a Christian preacher actually disposes his Christians & places them in the condition & makes them willing to follow after that to which he has admonished them. It is an evangelical admonition which lies before us here, which is based on the Gospel & directed to the believing Christians & which also always has its effect among Christians.

In v. 14 the apostle once again leads back to the actual possession of the Christians, in that he gives them the assurance that sin shall not be master over them, can & shall not conquer them. They find themselves even in a condition of freedom from sin, sin has lost its dominion, its $\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha$. And that comes from the fact that they are not under the Law, which only demands but does not give the power to fulfill the demand, but under grace, which enables them to avoid the evil & to do that which is good & right even before God. $\epsilon\kappa\tau\iota\mu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \mu\eta\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\alpha\tau\alpha$. Imagine.

The Summary of the Entire Section, 6, 1-4: The Apostle demonstrates that Christians henceforth no more to serve sin but to walk in righteousness, in that he reminds them of his fact that in baptism they have died to sin with Christ & have become partakers of the new divine life of Christ.

6, 15-23. The Service of Righteousness.

V. 15-18.

The second half of the chapter, which also forms a section of itself, begins the same as the first. "Wie nun? Sollens wir uns richten, weil wir nicht unter dem Gesetz sind, sondern unter der Gnade?" (What then? Shall we aim, because we are not under the law, but under grace?). V. 15. Is that, then, your intention? presented previously in V. 14? Under grace, own conditions of grace, give us license to sin? "God forbid."

That that is not so the Apostle proves again with an appeal to the Christian condition, which he now takes under a different point of view. "Wisset ihr nicht, dass wir uns euch selbst als Sklaven Gottes ergeben, Knechte seid ihr euer, welchen wir gehorchen?" (Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?) Οὐκ οἴσθε, ὅτι ὃ παρὶς τὰν ἑαυτοῦ εἰς

ὁπακοῖν, δοῦλοι ἐστε ὃ ὁπακούετε; V. 16. It is a generally accepted truth, well known to the Christians, that one is his servant to whom one gives or presents oneself in obedience. In the first part of the sentence the emphasis rests upon ὃ παρὶς τὰν ἑαυτοῦ εἰς ὁπακοῖν, in the second part on δοῦλοι. It would have been sufficient, if the Apostle had written: δοῦλοι ἐστε οὗτοῦ οὐ οὗτοῦ. In that he instead of that brings the concept of obedience to expression once again near in the second part of the sentence and introduces ὃ ὁπακούετε: οὐ οὗτοῦ, he would strongly call attention to the fact that obedience is certainly not free-will obedience, always draws after itself servitude. Knechte seid ihr euerem Herrn, eben demselben Knechte angehörig, welchen wir gehorchen, aus eigenem Ermessen, hervorgegangen aus der Wahl. Let first man had the freedom to choose a master for himself, to whom he would be obedient. But when he had once given himself into the service and obedience of this master, then this freedom ceased, then he can no longer do what he wills, but must do what his master would have of him, is bound to this master, cannot again be released from him by choice. Paul applies the general statement according to two sides, in man's action and in God's action: "If you are servants, entweder der Sünde, dem bösen, oder den heiligen, guten, gerechten Geist" (Whether of sin with death, or of obedience with righteousness). "If one gives himself into the service of sin, acquiesces in sin, then it soon

comes to the point that he is a servant of sin. He cannot make what he will of sin, where he would, but must do everything that sin commands him, even things from which he is free, and which he is bound to sin, cannot of himself release himself again from these bonds & chains. But the end of this way is death and condemnation. As servants of obedience to righteousness, ὃ ὁπακούετε εἰς ὁπακοῖν ὁ ἁγίου. Evidently here in contrast to sin, which is disobedience, obedience to God is meant. In this context the Apostle uses the ex-

232.
6, 15-18.

expressions ὑπακούω in various meanings. That is the other case, that one is obedient to obedience. That is a kind of paradox. The meaning is that that is the correct obedience when one obeys God, to whom every man owes obedience. And now when one presents oneself into the obedience of obedience, into the obedience of God, then he becomes a servant of obedience. When in all factors he does what the obedience over against God demands of him, he remains in the bounds of obedience. With him it comes to affirm, righteousness, he enters into the condition of righteousness, righteousness is his habit. Self-evidently under δικαιοσύνη the righteousness of God is to be understood. The Apostle here says something of the end of the ways of obedience & righteousness. In v. 21-23 the twofold end of the two-fold servitude, death & life, is expressed & self-evidently manifested. The εἰς ὅτι τοῦτο in v. 16 is a very anticipation.

The latter of the two cases mentioned takes place among the Christians. The Apostle calls to his Christian readers: But thank be to God, that you have become obedient from the heart & have become servants of righteousness. For those are the two principle concepts in the statements in v. 17 and v. 18. The Christians have experienced in themselves that free will obedience changes into servitude, still even also according to the good side, so that they owe God thanks for it. Certainly they have also had the experience of the servitude of sin. At this wretched servitude lies in the past for them, as they must acknowledge with thanks over against God. They have been servants of sin, but they are not no longer. In the sentence $\text{ὅτι ἦτε. ὁ ὅτι τοῦτο}$ the ἦτε is stressed. And now they are obedient from the heart. The object of the obedience is here designated thus: $\text{εἰς ὅτι. ὑπακούετε τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου}$. The sentence is to be analyzed: $\text{ὑποτασσάμενοι ἑκ. κ.ρ. δ' αὖτε. τῷ τῷ πνεύματι. ὑπακούετε τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου}$. The Christian readers have become obedient to the form of doctrine. $\text{τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου}$ is the Christian doctrine, the evangelical truth of salvation in the former stage, as it was present in the preaching of Paul & in general in the preaching of the Apostle. And this form of doctrine, which is effected & worked by the spirit of God Himself, is the standard form, for all times. Obedience over against the Christian doctrine & the correct form of doctrine is nothing else than faith. Faith is obedience over against the Gospel, & wills that over against Christ, over against the God of all grace. The Christians, with whom Paul deals here, are obedient from the heart, have become believers. That was the beginning of their Christianity. This willing obedience of faith is certainly a gift of God, for which one must thank God. It also reads: $\text{εἰς ὅτι. ὑπακούετε τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου}$. The Christians have been given over to the Christian doctrine, naturally from God. God has joined their hearts together in the form of Christian doctrine. Or in other words: God has worked faith in them. Nevertheless, it has become a free, willing obedience. God works even the willingness of faith. And the willing obedience has then drawn servitude to itself. The statement in v. 18, $\text{ἐπεὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποταγῆς τοῦ σώματος ὑπακούετε τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου}$, is, if not grammatically, then still logically dependent upon the ὅτι in v. 17; it describes further the content of the expression of thanks. So that those who are now Christians have become obedient to the Gospel & thus the grace of God, they

have become free, inwardly free from sin, from the servitude of sin; they have thereby been released to servitude under righteousness, have become servants of righteousness. Believing Christians are bound to righteousness & cannot escape from that. Whoever is born of God, cannot sin nor of live in sin. 1 John 3, 9. The new birth does not permit that. And if he sins, then he does not continue in that sin; he must again turn back immediately from the sin to the right track, into the service of righteousness. Righteousness has become a custom with him, like a second nature. His is a blessed subjection, the servitude of righteousness is true freedom. Out of that which has been said it becomes evident how little the condition of the Christian, the condition of grace gives the freedom to sin.

V. 18-23.

The Epistle ^{here} speaks humanly, really ad hominem. V. 18a. In the foregoing he had made use of a strong physical manner of expressions, in that he spoke of a servitude of righteousness, while otherwise the expression δουλεία, servitude, caused only malis sensus. He had done this because of the weakness of the flesh of his readers, not only because of their intellectual, but also because of their moral weakness. For the Gentile Christians were completely inclined to libertinism, stood in danger of abusing the Christian freedom, as this comes forth out of all the Pauline Epistles. 4. Cor. 5, 13. Therefore Paul had designated the condition of Christian freedom, the freedom from sin for righteousness, at the same time as a condition of servitude of righteousness. In as far as Christians still have flesh in themselves, they should know that they have a Lord over them whom they must obey. In the following the Epistle continues this strong manner of speech. The vs in v. 18b is to be taken explicatively. Now he follows with an admonition, which is essentially out of the preceding description of the Christian condition. In the first section of the chapter, 6, 1-14, he has in this second part, 6, 15-23, he adds to the reminder an expressive admonition, which modifies & strengthens the rejection of the question, which was brought forth in the introduction, in v. 12a and v. 15, whether we Christians should or can still sin.

The admonition now runs: "Νοπερ γὰρ παρεστῆκατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δουλῇ τῇ ἁκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἁνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἁνομίαν, οὕτως νῦν παρκατέβατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δουλῇ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν." "Wie ihr nämlich eure Glieder ergeben habt als dienethen der Unreinigkeit und Ungeheiligkeit, so beget jetzt eure Glieder als dienethen der Heiligkeit und Heiligung" ("as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness & to iniquity, unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness"). That would say: Previously, when you were Gentiles & servants of sin, you had placed your members to the disposition of sin, had given them into the service of uncleanness & iniquity to fulfill the iniquity, had done only what was not right before God. Both, ἁκαθαρσία and ἁνομία, are designations of sin in general. Sin is ἁκαθαρσία, uncleanness, corrupted body & soul, & ἁνομία, iniquity.

illegality, in that they denied & broke the divine rule & law. Thus it was previously. But now, since you have become Christians & servants of righteousness, you have given your members to the service of righteousness, to the sanctification of the body & soul. The *δικαιοσύνη* is the opposite of *ἐνομία*, & *ἡ ἀνομία* is the opposite of *ἐναγασία*. In their actions & conduct the Christians should show themselves as that which they are, as servants of righteousness, which are bound to righteousness, *δοῦλοι ἐν δέσσει τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*.

The sentence structure in vv. 20-23, added on with γὰρ, serves, as the previous reminder, for the strengthening of the admonition. The apostle turns to his Christian readers with the question: "Hil ichs fruchtlos der hinde ward, da ward ichs frein Bezug auf die Gerechtigkeith; welche Frucht hatet ich nun dan als?" ("If now when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness. What fruit had ye then without things of righteousness, if ye are now ashamed?") V. 20. 21a. Previously, you were servants of sin & free with regard to right-nessness, εἰ δ' ὁ θεὸς τοῦ ἁγίου δικαιοσύνην, untirally free & undrundered by righteousness, you had absolute-ly nothing to do with righteousness, you were entirely incapable & incongruent to fulfil anything that was right before God. And what fruit did you have at that time? εἰ τίς φρούτος, is here, as under similar con-structions, meant the work & conduct of man, the product of the working of the mind, of the moral act & nature. What was then the product of the servitude of sin? The answer reads: εἴ ποτε νόον ἐπαίε, ὁ ἴ-ν-ος, v. 21 b; such things of which you are now ashamed & must be ashamed, horrible blasphemy & shameful pleasure, of which you must also be ashamed for this reason, because they finally bring only death & condemnation, τὸ γὰρ τὸ τέλος ἐκείνου θάνατος. "Nun ichs aber wenders hinde beheit dagesen-lich necklich geworden seid, halt ichs eure Frucht zur Heiligung, als das Ende aber das ewige Leben" ("But now being made free from sin, & become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, & the end everlasting life"). V. 22. Now you have become free from the servitude of sin & have become servants of righteousness & thereby servants of God, really have become servants of God, sound ὡς ἐν τέλει. τὸ θεῶν, & thus your fruit is inclined toward sanctification. The product of the servitude of God is holy conduct, & good works, which are pleasing to God & necessary & salutary for man. But the end of sanctification, of this service of righteousness is eternal life. The apostle performs that which was said with an-oxism in v. 23: τὰ γὰρ ὁ φθώρας τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος. τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος εἰς ἡμῶν τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἁγίων ἡμῶν. "Dem der hinde hold ist der Tod, dagesenlich Snadung als holtend das ewige Leben in Christe Jesu unserm Herrn!" ("For the wages of him is death; but the gift of God is eternal life thru Jesus Christ our Lord"). The wages which sin pays to all those who have been obedient & served it faithfully in this life is death, death in the full sense of the word, physical death, but which, for the servants of sin is only the gateway to eternal death. That this statement agrees very well with what the apostle had taught in Rom. 5:12 ff. of the origin of death & the reign of death, we have given above. Death is the wages, the deserved reward of sin. On the other hand, eternal life is a free, un-deserved gift, a gracious gift of God, which is mediated & merited for us sinners by Christ Jesus.

our Lord. Hell is always deserved, heaven never. Nevertheless, eternal life, even if it is, is still blood, & is, of the way of sanctification. Sanctification is never a cause regardingly, but a result regardingly. God leads His own, whom He has justified & saved by grace, even upon this way, the way of sanctification, contrary to their goal. It is very plain how that which the Apostle carries out in this section, vv. 20-23, motivates the foregoing admonition. The fatal results of the earlier servitude of him must frighten the Christians away from sin; the blessed results of the present servitude, righteousness, must encourage to sanctification.

In the entire section, vv. 15-23, the Apostle had considered & presented these vitals of sin as something which belongs to its part among the Christians, & summons the latter therefore to break out against God, because they have been freed from this servitude. But there lies herein for the Christians not only an exhortation hereforth not to serve sin any more, but at the same time a earnest warning. Christians should know & well consider that they, when they misuse their Christian freedom & again acquiesce in sin, also become servants of sin again & fall back into the former abominations of the heathen; that they are, if they again serve sin, have to expect nothing else than death & condemnation. Certainly, that is also a critical question, dependent on death & life, salvation or condemnation, whether a Christian, after he is justified, walks in sin & pursues sanctification.

The summary of the section, 6:15-23: The Spirit strengthens the former admonition here with no longer to serve sin but God's righteousness, in that he reminds the Christians of his fact that the service of sin has ceased for them & that they have now become servants of God & righteousness, & at the same time points to the final end of double service - death & eternal life.

Chapter VII.

7, 1-6. The Freedom from the Law.

With the words in 7:1 "Οὐκ ἐνισχύει δὲ ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, οἵτινες κατανοοῦσι πάντα καταβολήν." ("Know ye not brethren, [I do speak to them that know the law?] how that the law hath dominion over us man as long as we live?") a new section evidently begins. The form which is loved by Paul, "know ye not," "ἤ γινώσκετε, always, at least correctly presents the plain & obvious of the presented truth in contrast with an indisputable truth, now the indisputable fact now introduced comes.) For the confirmation of that which was said previously we can, but judiciously when we have ourselves realized both the word and the content of this new section, 7:6. The hostile he brings our instruction of the Law. He speaks to such who know the Law, γινώσκοντες νόμον. He says not: I speak to those among you who know the Law, that is, to the Jewish Christians. Then he would have had to write ὑμεῖς γινώσκοντες etc. Alternatively the assumption that Paul turns himself in this entire section expressly to the Jewish Christian section

of the Roman congregation, has no support in the text. The address, ἀδελφοί, applies here, as otherwise, to all Christian readers of the Letter. All Christians, also the Gentile Christians, knew & knew the Law, the revealed, in case of the beginning of the Christian assemblies also the L. was read. The apostolic preaching, as the basis of the Epistles & the Letters of the Apostles were, entered into the L. completely. The Law always was a part of the ecclesiastical public doctrine. Thus, for the Christians in general, because they knew the Law, the statement is also acknowledged: ὁ δὲ νόμος ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἐφ' ὅσον ἢ ποῦν § 7. It is pure arbitrariness, when Philippi takes the § 7 in an ethical meaning: "As long as man lives, that is, continues his old, natural life, he is a servant of the Law; first when he has died spiritually he is freed from the dominion of the Law." That is a thought that first comes forth in the second half of the section, v. 4-6, & is indicated by nothing in our verse. It is, as most of the commentators acknowledge, a general statement, an axiom which lies at the foundation of the entire Law & all the individual statements of the Law, that the Law is man's ordinance, which has the power & right to speak to & command man as long as he lives. The dominion of the Law reaches out over the entire time of life, but not beyond it. The demands of the Law apply to man who lives in the flesh, & expires with death. When a man has died, there can be no more discussions concerning his guilt or the transgressions of the Law. When a man has died, then it shall be paid him accordingly as he has lived his life in the body, then the Law is broken, the Judge, an measuring stick of judgment and of recompense. It hardly needs the remark that the Apostle here places himself solely on the standpoint of the Law. But of all looks away entirely from the change & conduct which Christ has brought.

The general statement that the obligation of the Law is first broken off by the death of a man, but also really by death, Paul proves & clarifies in v. 2, 3 by an example, the statement of the Law regarding marriage. The allegorical interpretation of this statement of the will & the two husbands, which is found among ancient commentators & lately maintained especially by Philippi, is arbitrary, without any support in the text. First, from v. 4 on there follows the allegorical application of the statement of the Law standing in the discussion. The Mosaic marriage Law included the following points. A woman, who is committed to the man, that is, married, ἡ ἰνὸν ἄνδρα γυνή, is bound by the Law to the living man, that is, to the man as long as he lives. But when the man has died, then she is released from the Law of the husband, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός, that is, from the Law which concerns the husband, that she should be the wife of this man & of no other. It says of the wife: καὶ ὅτι γυνὴ ἡ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός. The καὶ ὅτι γυνὴ really fits only the Law. The Law which concerns the husband, the marriage, is put away, is put out of power & application for the wife, as soon as the husband has died. And it only a pregnant form of speech that it is said of the wife that she is loosed with regard to that Law. The meaning is that thru the death of the husband she has become free & unincumbered of that designation of the Law, of the constraint to the husband. Out of the mentioned double designation (ἡ ἰνὸν ἄνδρα, v. 2) it follows, & this will make the matter as much the more significant, that the wife, when she in the lifetime of her husband, ὡς τὸν ἀνδρα, comes to own another husband, ἐκὶν ἄνδρα ἡ ἰνὸν ἄνδρα, is called an adulteress, ἡ πορνῆς.

on the other hand, if her husband has died, she is freed from the law which had bound her to the husband, so that she is now no longer an adulteress, if she marries another husband. The verb $\gamma\gamma\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota\delta\epsilon\iota$ designates really "flouting ecclesiastical brethren" (to occupy oneself with state affairs) then "assuming titles" (to have a title of office), in later Greek in about as much as "wieder geltend", 1. "heissen" (to name or call). The infinitive clause, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma\chi\alpha\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omega$, gives, like all such infinitive clauses, not the result but the purpose: 'damit sie nicht $\delta\epsilon\eta\upsilon\epsilon\chi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ ' ("so that she is no adulteress"). That is the purpose of her freedom from the law, which lies in the divine ordinance of the law that now, after the death of her husband, she can marry again, without being guilty of adultery. In the added example now containing the same reason, the reason here from the law is the cause of a certain different person. The husband dies, & the wife is thus freed from the law; this it is hereby assumed as self-understood, that first of all the husband, when he dies, is freed of the law which concerns marriage. But now the marriage law refers even to the relationship of the husband to the wife & of the wife to the husband. "Husband's wife here in their belonging to one another forms the unitary subject of a designation of the law, according to which the woman should be the wife of this & no other man, as long, but also only as long as he lives." Hofmann. It treats here of a mutual obligation, & when such a mutual obligation loses, on one effect for the one part, then it is also removed from the other part of the same. Because in the foregoing case the fact that death releases all obligations of the law, becomes apparent very concretely in a person still living, there the Apostle very well mentioned this example. And moreover in this choice he had certainly had in mind already the allegorical application in mind, with which he now follows in vv. 4-6.

That to which the Apostle would point with his instruction from the law & concerning the law in vv. 1-3, is shown in v. 4: "I, empfangen, meine Brüder, sind aus dem Gesetz durch Christi Tod, damit wir Frucht bringen, nicht" ("Whereby ^{my} brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God"). In short the sense of this word is that through Christ's death we are released from the law & now belong to Christ. That is a truth that transcends the law, that first became known through the Gospel, that first became known through the Gospel, that belongs to the Gospel. Thus this statement is no deduction from the preceding applications in vv. 1-3. For the law says nothing of Christ; from the teaching of the law one can conclude nothing regarding Christ & His salvation. From the fact that the law in its separate commandments has something to say to man only as long as he lives, that the wife is bound to the husband by the law only so long as the husband lives, it still does not really follow that the Christians now are released in general & completely from the law through Christ. But the $\omega\varsigma$ & $\tau\epsilon$ with which the statement in v. 4 is introduced, is also originally not a particle of inference. "Ὡς & $\tau\epsilon$ is made up of $\omega\varsigma$ and $\tau\epsilon$ and originally & throughout in the ancient profane Greek means 'wie', 'gleichwie', 'from' (which then the consecutive significance 'folglich', 'so dass' developed, insofar as that which follows from a

premise has a similarity with this premise. And so in our case only the "Übereinstimmigkeit" (agreement) is clearly
 shown, with which the following joins itself to the preceding: "(Folgerung) We translate it best of all
 with "demgemäß" (accordingly), "dementsprechend" (correspondingly), or like Hofmann, with "und so".
 Further with his translation: "Aber auch meine Brüder haben auf die Wahrheit vollständig verstanden, dass
 das, was in v. 1-3 und das, was in v. 4 eine Ähnlichkeit, die letztere illustriert die former.
 To the general statement, v. 1, that death removes the obligation of the Law for every man, corresponds the fact that
 a death has intervened, Christ's death, & that Christ's death has put an end to all obligation of the Law & the entire
 Law. And to the added example of the wife & the two husbands corresponds the fact that those who are now Christ-
 ians first belonged to the Law as their lawful spouse, had been bound to the Law but now thru a death, Christ's
 death, they are released from the Law & belong henceforth as their lawful spouse, namely, Christ the risen One. That
 is the tertium comparationis. With that one must remain standing & dare not press the image in the remain-
 ing part. We now stand closer to the constituent parts of the foregoing statement: "Ὁς τε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐσμὲν τῷ
 θανάτῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ". Dementsprechend sind auch ihr dem Tode durch
 den Leib Christi. ("Wherefore ye also are become dead to the Law by the body of Christ"). This the Spirit gives
 the Christians to consider. The Christians, like the wife to her husband, are dead to the Law, & thus dead for the
 Law, & this certainly thru the body of Christ, who was put to death on the cross. Christ has been put to
 death according to the flesh & has with His powerful, bloody death paid the final tribute to the Law, & thereby
 has put an end to the Law, has put the Law out of power & effect, the Law both in its demands as well as in its
 threats. Cf. Eph. 2:15: ἐν τῷ σαρκὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἐν σώματι καταργήσας. By His death
 Christ has first of all redeemed us from the curse of the Law, but then also from the dominion & power of the Law.
 And now thru Baptism's faith, as the Spirit has previously brought into remembrance, we Christians have
 become partakers of the death of Christ, of the fruit of His death, of His redemption & thus are loose, free, unre-
 cumbrated of the Law, even also from the dominion, the binding force, from the jurisdiction & coercion of the
 Law. Now in this connection it treats of the κυριατοῦ of the Law. The Law is no more lord over us, has nothing
 more to say to us. The former relationship to the Law, that we were subject to the Law, like the wife to the husband, is
 dissolved, completely & eternally dissolved. We are dead to the Law, dead for the Law, have nothing more to do
 with the Law, & the Law nothing more with us. If he also has in mind first of all the Jewish Christians, who had
 formerly lived under the Law, then he still would not have the Gentile Christians excluded here. The Law, & even
 the revealed, Mosaic Law, as far as it is a moral Law, is meant for all men, & it places before all men to whom
 it comes the demand that they subject themselves to it. The Gentile Christians are not, because they are
 Gentiles but because they are Christians, loose & free from the Law only thru Christ. To the Law you are dead, "aus-
 dem ihr eueres Andersseins wegen, dem, dem von dem Tode auferweckt ist." ("that ye should be married
 to another, even to him who is raised from the dead"). εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ἑμῶς ἐτέραν, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι.
 I have the Spirit continue. Thru Baptism's faith the Christians are bound to Christ, the crucified & risen One, are

joined to Christ, who has risen from the dead & lives eternally, like the wife to the husband. The risen & living Christ, after the law has been put away thru the death of Christ, is now our legal spouse & husband; He alone has the power & right to speak to us. And when this relationship of ours to Christ it is aimed at, as this is now about the case, that we might bring fruit to God, ἵνα καὶ ποτὶ οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ. The fruit of good works is meant, which are to God's love & honor. Here, as everywhere where the good works of the Christians are called fruit, the picture of the harvest of the field & the fruit of the tree is at the bottom of it. To point the καὶ ποτὶ οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ to the fruit of marriage, καὶ ποτὶ καὶ ἡμῶν, is to press the picture of the marriage improperly such changing of persons, as we meet it in this verse, ἔσονται ὡς ἕνα - ὅμοιοι - καὶ ποτὶ οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ - is found frequently with Paul. To the content of the foregoing statement there still may well be addressed ὁ ἅγιος πνεῦμα. The Spirit, who comforted & cheered himself in Rom. 8:16 "Now the law's arm dead to the law, that I might live in the Spirit. I am crucified with Christ", feels himself closely attached & attached to the Christians from among the Jews & Gentiles, who in a similar manner have escaped from the law & belong only to Christ & to God, as his beloved brethren, his spiritual relatives.

"Denn da wir im Fleische waren, waren die Leidenschaften der Sünden, die durch das Gesetz regiert wurden, in uns aktiv. Die Leidenschaften, die durch das Gesetz regiert wurden, waren in uns aktiv. Nun aber sind wir los geworden vom Gesetz, indem wir abgestorben dem Gesetz sind, so dass wir dienen in neuen Weisen, die nicht im alten Weisen des Buchstabens." ("For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, & not in the oldness of the letter"). V. 5:6. This double statement evidently joins itself to the immediately preceding statement of purpose, ἵνα καὶ ποτὶ οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ. For also in v. 5 is found the expression καὶ ποτὶ οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ, & with the "serve in newness of spirit" certainly nothing else is meant than the fruit of good works. Thus the statements in v. 5:6 introduced with γὰρ serve the sentence that we should now bring fruit unto God, not only as a proof, but as an illustration. With the words ὁ ἅγιος πνεῦμα ὁ ἅγιος πνεῦμα the Apostle reminds the Christians, first of all of their former condition before they became Christians. Before they were Christians they were in the flesh, where their evil being was controlled & confined in the old corrupt nature. Paul includes himself here with all Christians; for among the Jews & Gentiles, who previously had walked according to the flesh & had served sin, & look away from the fact that there were also Jewish Christians who before their baptism had been believing Israelites & had been born anew thru faith in the promise. Nevertheless

) the being in the flesh is the condition into which every man is born. That we are in the flesh brings with it all the fact that the motions of the sin were active in our members. The expression καὶ ποτὶ οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ designates exactly that which we call emotions. I. 2:3 v. 1 is used of the effects & temper of the human heart & is initially not medical, but in later Greek under the influence of the Stoics to be understood the effect of the passions in the mind, whose dominion man's conduct is immediately affected. (Clemens) And to this is added in our passage & in

two passages in the N. T. where it is also present, Gal. 5: 17: Οἱ τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ ἔσθ' ὁρῶντες οὐκ ἐστὶν παρορμήσιν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Ep. Παύλ. ἁγίου, Rom. 1: 26. Τὰ παρορμήματα τοῦ ἁγίου are the emotions which work themselves out in sins, in acts of sin. These emotions were active, ἐν γὰρ γένοιτο, in our members, in that the members of the body carried the evil impulses & effects into fulfillment. The emphasis, however, now lies on the members of παρορμήματα, on τὰ δὲ σώματα. For Paul in this entire context calls attention to that which is a fact, that we are freed from the Law. The emotions were mediated through the Law, were stirred up by the Law. That fact the Epistle carries out more closely in the next section. Thus in carnal men the Law only promotes sin. There is still to be said here what Weiss remarks: "By this modification it is thus pointed out, that the ἁγίου is, characterized in the life in the flesh as such, as they were active everywhere in the pre-Christian conditions, also were not put away by the life under the Law, but could only be weakened, but in no way that they were also agitated by this also among the Gentile Christians, who actually had this not stood under the Law. There, even Paul does not write simply ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, but only designates the ἁγίου as such which have the property to be promoted only always by the Law." Only one must still take along the fact that in his time before Christ the Law, "more had become known to many Gentiles, as it is now known in the whole world, & these Gentile Christians had entirely, the same experience with the Law that the Jews did. And finally it also applies what Philippi remarks concerning the Law of conscience, "which the Gentiles possessed as a substitute for the Mosaic Law," this "shining forth of the divine revealed Law," that it promoted the lusts of the flesh. We do the emotions of the sins aimed in his last analysis is treated by the sentence ἐξ ὅ καὶ ποτὶ ἡμᾶς τὸ ἁγίου, that we should bring forth unto death. Here also the ἐξ shows not the result, but as always, only the purpose. That was the inclination, as it were, the tendency of the emotions, to work themselves out through the members of the body in acts of sin & thus to bring forth the evil wicked fruit, shameful works, which finally work death & condemnation. 1: 26, 27. The Apostle James describes the same process of evil, 1: 15: "Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: & sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." And now in that the Law agitates the evil lusts, it also helps man to death.

"The backward glance into the past should only place the present of the Christians in a much brighter light."
 "Now alive" ("but now"), as it reads further in v. 5, but now a change has entered in, since we became Christians, and
 now "indem wir los geworden sind von dem Gesetz" ("we are delivered from the law"), v. 10 p. 7, b. p. v. have become
 free even numbered of the law, which only helped to give death. The Apostle repeats unobtrusively, only with
 other words, what he had already said previously, v. 10, and broadens the modifiers: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$
 $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$. Behind $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ — for that is the more acceptable — the only reading that fits into
 the context, not $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ — $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \sigma\omega\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ is to be supplied. Thus we have to translate: "indem wir
 abgethan dem, worin wir festgehalten wurden" ("that being dead wherein we were held"). That wherein we
 were held as in a prison is, according to the context, the Law. For of the Law it had been said in v. 5, that

our entire being had been concluded therein. The being in the flesh brought with itself as fact that the Law made the emotions active & thus compelled & bowed us under sin. And in that we are now dead to the flesh, we are now also delivered from the Law, from the distressing dominion of the Law. In that we are dead to the sinful flesh, to sin, we are dead to the Law. "It has become a liberating death out of the compulsion & jurisdiction of the inborn nature, wherein the detachment from the Law completely itself." Thus Schott, Hofmann, Weiss & Luthardt completely correct explain the participial clause according to our meaning. When one, like most commentators, understands the Law as that under which we were held, then there is a pure tautology, for to be delivered from the Law & to be dead to the Law is one & the same thing, & the parallelism with v. 5, where the tyranny of the Law is coupled with the being in the flesh, is lost. But in v. 6 the deduction has the emphases: $\delta\omega\tau\epsilon \delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \epsilon\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \nu\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota \pi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ - $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \circ\delta \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota \gamma\gamma\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. For in contrast to the previous condition under sin & the Law this characterizes the present condition of the Christians, which results from the deliverance from the flesh & the Law; it describes the present, the fruit-bringing of the Christians. Since we have been delivered from the flesh & the Law, therefore we now, all-evidently, are freed in newness of spirit. The $\epsilon\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \nu\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota \pi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ gives the "sphere of activity of the $\delta\omega\tau\epsilon \delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ". $\kappa\alpha\iota \nu\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$

is here meant concretely designates the new condition & situation in which the Christian finds himself, the new essence & life in which he moves & acts himself. That is the "new essence of the spirit." This new essence & life is engendered by the Spirit of God & is ruled & governed by the Spirit of God, who is in the Christians. Or, what is the same thing, in that we add the statement in v. 4b: it is the risen, living Christ, who works, works all good, brings forth glorious fruit through the Spirit in the Christians, who have become partakers of His resurrection life. And this fruit of the Spirit is the real heart-pleasing worship. "His service, this worship excludes entirely the other service, the $\delta\omega\tau\epsilon \delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \nu\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota \gamma\gamma\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, "and nicht in alten Werten des Buchstabens! (and not in the oldness of the letter)". That which is denied the Christian is that they serve in the old sin's essence, which is only subjected to the outward letter of the Law, in which man has before & over himself only the strong demands of the Law, which give no power for good, but which much rather only agitate the sinful heart. i.e. the above here describes regarding the essence of the condition of the Christian is also really the essence of the condition, which is not dissolved by the daily weakness, which are put away in daily repentance & contrition. I think the remarks on the expression $\gamma\gamma\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$: "That $\gamma\gamma\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ designates the Mosaic Law & only this is understood here"

) However, it should follow from that, that Paul meant to himself with this Jewish condition is still not to be included here. He does not say that the $\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \circ\delta \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota \gamma\gamma\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ had been their common, former condition, but only that their common freedom from the Law had been revealed & that, or then only the $\kappa\alpha\iota \nu\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota \gamma\gamma\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, that is, this form of the old which he came to pass, which he had learned to know in his legal time & which would enter in among them all, if they would be placed under the Law, which would have happened inevitably without this

Thus, we Christians, because we are redeemed by Christ & have become partakers of His redemption & His faith & Baptism, are declared & released from the Law, not only from the curse of the Law, but also from the dominion & binding force of the Law. The Law, even the revealed written Law, is no longer our King, has nothing more to say to us; we are no longer bound in the Law. *Non christianis estis multiplicati legibus, nec est leges et omnia moenia, neque non amplius nobis dominatur, erga et regit nos... neque estis ei. nunc obligati.* Romans. That the Apostle alludes as specifically as possible in this section, Rom. 7, 1-6. And we should guard ourselves well that we do not limit or reduce in various evangelical truths. Above all, we Christians are not masterless, are not sovereigns; our own will is not our own law for us. We are free, but free in God. We live to God, we are in God, we bring fruit to God. We stand under God & are bound as creatures of God, who as our creatures, in the unchangeable will of God. But when we go about to fulfill the will of God, then the next important question for us is not: What does the Law demand of me? but: What is will pleasing to Christ, my Lord & Redeemer & Bridegroom? What is pleasing to my God, to the God who is reconciled to me through Christ? Now & with what can I best serve my beloved heavenly Father? And these questions answer themselves of themselves. The Holy Spirit, who is in us, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of God teaches us to do according to God's good pleasure & leads us along a more pleasant way, creates in us a desire for & a bringing forth of the good. These good works, which the Holy Spirit brings forth out of the believers, cover themselves certainly with the works of which the Law speaks. The mind & will of the Spirit of God, who teaches, moves, leads, & rules us inwardly, conforms itself with the unchangeable will of God, which has also found expression in the Law of God. But the works of the believers are therefore in no way works of the Law but fruits of the Spirit. In his coming & going the Christian does not respect Law: I will make every effort to fulfill all the strict demands of the Law as precisely & minutely as possible, but without much reflection, freely, of himself to set all his good works flow forth out of his heart, by the power & influence of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine of the Christians does not mean freedom from the Law, does not make us Antinomians, does not contradict that which the Formula of Concord emphasizes in Art. II: *de libertate usque legibus*. The Law, "the written Law" is & remains a definite rule & standard of a blessed life & conduct, even for believing, regenerated Christians, & only for them; for unconverted men cannot walk according to this rule, to them the Law must first of all serve as a mirror, from which they can recognize their sins. Still one must here distinguish carefully. Therefore & insofar as the believing Christians still need the rule of the Law, because & as far as they still bear in themselves their sinfulness, is not insofar as they are Christians & regenerated. Our long sermon elaborates on that. And, indeed, if the believing & elect children of God were completely renewed in this life by the indwelling Spirit, so that in their nature & all its powers they were entirely free from sin, they would need no Law, and since no one to drive them either, but they would do of them their own, & altogether voluntarily without any instructions, admonitions, urging or driving of the Law; what they are in duty bound to do according to God's will, just as the sun, the moon, & all the constellations of heaven have their regular course of themselves,

unobstructed, without admonitions, warning, force, or compulsion, according to the word of God which has been
 "agreed" in the morning, just as the holy angels, "rejoice an entirely necessary existence." (Reg. p. 103.)
 but because "to the believing, elect, & regenerated children of God" "in this life the old beams will always shine,"
 therefore "they need the daily instructions & admonitions, warning & threatening of the Law." Because of "their
 enmities" & because they are still so perverse & disinclined to good, they still have need for the warning & threat-
 ening of the Law, the good of the cross. And because they still are hindered with much error & foolishness, which
 is a part of the sinful flesh, because they so easily "turn back according to their own thoughts," "they hinder"
 their own devotion & holiness, "therefore they also still need the daily instruction of the Law, so that they
 learn from the Ten Commandments which are the real, God-giving words. On this clear head, as in a mirror
 is shown away by the Spirit of God he is taught by God & "does many things for himself, as the Spirit; & thus
 are called out properly works of the Law, but works of the Law, as in some manner, it is shown in
 'mines' and 'the Law of Christ.' These works mean are no more with the Law, and under grace, as St. Paul says, Rom.
 7, 2 (Rom. 7, 23); 1 Cor. 9, 21." (Reg. p. 267.)

In that we finally compare very shortly the two sections 6, 13-23 and 7, 1-10, in order to understand how they
 hold together, therefore we become aware of a striking similarity. In the first the Epistle shows the Christians that
 they are free from sin, from the servitude of sin; in the latter that they are delivered from the Law from
 the dominion of the Law; in the first that they are now servants under God, in the latter that they are bound to
 Christ as their Bridegroom. In both he points to death as the end of the service of sin, and in that in 7, 1-3 he like-
 wise calls special attention to the fact that the Law promotes sin, as well as that we, in that we are dead to the
 sinful flesh, are released from the Law; thus he shows the connection between sin & the Law, between freedom
 from sin & freedom from the Law; thus the latter amplification serves for the confirmation of the foregoing
 in 6, 13-23, & establishes together with the latter the admonition, 6, 14, to serve righteousness. Correctly one
 has also called attention to the fact that here the short statement in 6, 14, 15, that the Christians are not under
 the Law, is modified & amplified. We can accordingly put this first section of the 7. chapter in the statement:

The Epistle reminds the Christians, in order to further establish his previous admonitions, of the
 fact that they are delivered from the Law through the death of Christ & now belong to Christ, the risen One, and are
 governed by the Spirit.

1) 7, 7-12. The Purpose and Effect of the Law.

In the previous section the Epistle had attested two things to the Christians, first, that they even since
 they became Christians, have been delivered from sin, & then, that they have been delivered from the Law; thus he
 had compared with one another the freedom from the servitude of sin & freedom from the servitude of the
 Law. From that it appears to follow: "Was sollen wir nun sagen? Ist das leicht für die?" ("What shall

we say then? Is the Law sin?"). Ο νόμος ἁμαρτία; v. 12. The meaning of the question is not whether the Law is identical with sin, as, for example, Hofmann & Luthardt would have it. That would be an absolutely absurd statement which also is not explained or caused by the fact that one says the questioner would reproach the hypothesis that his foregoing amplification comes out to an absurdity. The words, ο νόμος ἁμαρτία; also do not signify whether the Law is the originator of sin, but only whether the Law is sinful, "in itself somewhat evil & consequently somewhat shameful" (Ludet), & that would be the case, if the Law demanded something sinful, shameful from man. The interpretation of ἁμαρτία in the sense of ἁμαρτωλός, abstractum pro concreto, is also confirmed by the contrast ο νόμος ἁγιος, v. 12. The hypothesis points back to that deduction energetically with Μὴ γένοιτο. But if he had then continued with ἀλλὰ, then he would not have introduced a contrast, but a declaration which would limit the denial that the Law is sin. With Luther, Fritzsch, De Wette, Weiss, Godt & Luthardt we translate the ἀλλὰ with "aber", "aber doch". The meaning is: The Law is not sin, not in itself evil & sinful, but really it has something to do with sin, it really stands in a certain reference to sin. And this is now the purpose of the hypothesis to determine exactly the actual relationship of the Law to sin.

And the first thing which he now says concerning this is: τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων, εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμον. τὴν γὰρ ἑπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγε ν: Οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶ εἰς. He speaks here, as in the following, with "I", but what he says of himself is a general truth, as then for every man who comes into contact with the Law. Here Paul chooses this form of instruction, so that he might illustrate what he would teach concerning the effect of the Law in his own example, in his own experience. Modern expositors, like Hofmann, Weiss, Luthardt & Meyer, understand the foregoing statement thus, that the hypothesis had learned to know by experience, means of the Law the sin which had at first remained strange to him in reference to his own personality, the awakening of the Lust had been with him the first vision of a spontaneous sinful conduct. But looking away from the fact that a difference of that kind of natural sin & personal evil conduct is otherwise foreign to the Scriptures, in our passage εἰ νων, where it alternates with ᾔδειν, evidently designates a simple knowing, cognition; what the hypothesis says of himself; that he had learned to know sin by the Law is exactly the same thing that he had presented in 2, 20 as a common opinion: "By the Law is the knowledge of sin." Then the formula of Concord states: "Everything that punishes sin is & belongs to the Law, where one of his is to punish sin & to lead to the knowledge of sin. Rom. 3 and 7." And in the same sense Rom. 7, 1 has been taken by most of the ancient expositors, & among the more recent especially Thüsing & Schell. Man errs? since from his birth on & sees in that which he has perceived & done as a natural weakness, a hardly pardonable mistake; first when the Law comes upon him does he really recognize therein as that what it is, as conduct displeasing to God, as opposition against the will of God. Paul makes that clearly an example, by the commandment which forbids covetousness: "Denn ich wusste ja nicht, daß wenn-

designates the actual sin. In our passage it reads just the opposite, that it brings forth the lust. Therefore under *ἀμαρτία* evidently the source & root of all evil things, which are themselves evil, are to be understood. The expositors define *ἀμαρτία*, as it is used in 7, 5, as "Potenz (power) der Sünde" or "Prinzip der Sünde", or "Hang" (inclination), or "Trieb (impetus) zum Bösen", or "depravation of nature", or *malitia naturalis*, or "Erbsünde", etc. It is *ἡ οἰκὸς αἰς ἑμὶ. ἀμαρτία*, 7, 17, 20, the sin dwelling in man; we rather say: "the natural, perverted, God-depleting tendency of the mind & will of man. This then begets evil thoughts, wishes, desires, & finally also evil acts. But now it is the Law & the sin like the emphasis in our passage, which gives occasion & opportunity to the sin to work all evil desires, or much rather: sin, in that it works evil lusts, takes occasion in the commandment. Then with Philippi & others we take the expression: *ἀφορμὴν λαβούσα* *ἐκ τῆς ἐντολῆς*. Most expositors separate *ἐκ τῆς ἐντολῆς* from *ἀφορμὴν λαβούσα* & connect it with *κατεργάσατο* and translate thus: "indem die Sünde Gelegenheits nahm, hat sie durch das Gebot alle Lust in mir gewirkt." To be sure, the text always otherwise says *ἀφορμὴν λαβούσα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐντολῆς* or *παρὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς*. But some prepositional modification is absolutely necessary, when *ἀφορμὴν λαβούσα* is supposed to have a sense in general. It must still be remarked what the object is to which the Commandment gives occasion. And since the Law itself now expresses himself, otherwise that by the Law's motions are made active, 7, 5, or that sin is put to death by the Commandment, 7, 12, and thus the expression, that sin works lust by the Commandment, lies very close to him, therefore we properly accept the fact that he here blends into one the two forms of speech, which finally present the same sense, namely, *ἀφορμὴν λαβούσα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐντολῆς* κατεργάσατο and *ἐκ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατεργάσατο* and has combined the *ἐκ τῆς ἐντολῆς* with *ἀφορμὴν λαβούσα* as the necessary supplement. Koerner remarks on the matter: "peccati occasio per legem, hoc est, non legis damnationis κατεργάσατο, effect, genus, accidens in imaginis πᾶσα ὑπονοία, omnium conspirantium; idque in me non tantum, sed in quolibet non venato effect, ut conspirantibus magis inlammatur audita prohibitionis, et vehementius adversum Deum premit et vitatur in relictum; quod non tam vitio legis, quam malitia depravatae naturae, aut peccati in nobis habitantis effectus; quod solet declarari similitudine de calce, quae rursus accenditur aqua, alio vero restringitur. Itaque peccatum lege augeri, evangelio autem minui dicitur. And Kodel writes: "It treats here with that well-known experience already typified by the ancients, that man always inclines to the forbidden fruit. Cf. Prov. 7, 17. The prohibition has the effect of firmly fixing the object in the power of imagination & thereby inviting it with a new attraction. The heart is as bewitched by it & the dormant yearning changes itself into an intensive desire. Thus, so to speak, every word of the Commandment has the characteristic that it awakens a new lust in the heart. But this will be considered that that happens, only because sin, the egoistic impetus already exists in the heart. 'The Commandment itself' does not bring forth this effect; sin, so to speak, exploits the Commandment, for this purpose. And the Apostle himself in the following explains how far sin on occasion only means the Commandment since all evil lusts arise.

It reads further: "Wenn ohne das Gesetz die Sünde todt, wie als ob sie nicht ohne das Gesetz, als aber aus Gebot kam, lebte die Sünde auf" ("For without the Law sin was dead. For I was alive without the Law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived"). Vv. 1-9. These three sentences hang closely together; the first two form the setting for the third, which has its own basis. At least the Law sin is dead. That Paul had also experienced in his time, when he lived without the Law. But when the commandment came, sin revived in him. And that is an experience which all men have with the Law. When the Law comes, sin revives & becomes powerful, efficacious, works all works of evil but is driven. That is what the *negus rerum* is that also without the Law, without the article the Mosaic Law is meant in the doubled *γυνίς νόμος*, as it does so often otherwise, which some exegetes doubt, is shown by the context, in vv. 7-10, which would give instructions concerning the revealed Law, in which *ὁ νόμος*, *νόμος*, and *ἐξ* 17. are interchanged with one another. So that we never suspect the three-membered statement more closely with individual parts than the question arises at the very beginning: What time does the Apostle have in mind when he writes in v. 9a: *ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξ* 17. *νόμος* *νόμος* *νότος*? This question, however, hangs closely together with the others. How are these words to be continued & what does *ἐξ* 17. signify here. Most expositors place *ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξ* 17. in contrast to *ἐμπρὶς νότος*, v. 2, as well as to *ἐγὼ δὲ ἀνὲς* 17. v. 10, take *ἐξ* 17. *νόμος* *νόμος* *νότος* as an independent concealingonymism

with: "I was alive, and *ἐγὼ* *νόμος* *νόμος* as a virtual subordinate sentence, in the sense: "als ich ohne das Gesetz war." And older exegetes, like Tholius & Kalon, now designate as the time when Paul was without the Law as his time of being a Pharisee. Then he had still not felt the good of the Law, who had still not correctly known & felt sin, since he had been alive according to his certainly erroneous thought, since he had stood in the delusion that he was righteous & acceptable before God & already in possession of life eternal. But it is still absolutely impossible that Paul should have characterized his time of being a Pharisee, in which he by all his powers strove after the righteousness of the Law, in which he was really under the Law, as a life, a condition *sine lege* and *extra legem*. Most modern exegetes refer the *ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξ* 17. *νόμος* *νόμος* *νότος* to the early childhood of Paul, but then, like Meyer, Weiss & Hodel, they paint the same with colors, which they take from their imagination & not from actual facts, as "the death-free life of childlike innocence," as a "condition of life similar to the condition in Paradise of the first parents," as a "real beginning of the life in God, a pure flame, which without doubt was afterward stifled by his own righteousness." The Scriptures know nothing of such a paradisiacal condition in the life of the children of men, who are conceived & born in sin. We agree with the point, that Paul here looks back into his time of his early child-

hood, of his minority, but we understand his statement simply that he once, when he was still a child & not of age, lived without the Law, lived his existence, so that thus there was a time for him, when sin was dead. We do not pack everything possible into *ἐξ* 17. *νόμος* *νόμος* *νότος*, but much rather lay the stress on *ἐγὼ* *νόμος* *νόμος*, and take this, the same as the *νότος* placed at the end as a modifier to *ἐξ* 17. *νόμος* *νόμος* *νότος* were meant as a subordinate sentence, then *νότος* would have to follow immediately in back of *ἐξ* 17. *νόμος* *νόμος* *νότος*, to which it belongs in any case. The intended contrast between

248.
7, 7-12.

death & life lie in the *ἐναγρία* *νεκρῶν*, v. 11b, and *ἡ ἐναγρία ἔστι ψεῦδος*, v. 12b. Thus Origen had already understood the expression of Paul, in that he adds in explanation: *τὰς ἀφ' ἧς ἐρωτᾷ ἔστι χαρὶς νόμου* *τὰς, ὅτι ἐπαίδειν ἔτι*. In his early childhood man lives without the Law, in that he still does not know the Law or is not rightly acquainted with its content & meaning. We cannot, that man, to whom first in his later years of life God's Word & Law come near, also in their more mature years in a certain sense without the Law, live in their ignorance & sin in ignorance. Only then one must take into consideration, that with all men, when they enter into the *anni discretionis*, that the natural Law & the conscience exercise a similar function, like the revealed Law. After the Law-less period there followed for Paul a time when the Law came, *ἐλθούσης τῆς ἐντολῆς*, when the Law, especially the Commandment, "Thou shalt not covet," became known to him, entered into his consciousness. That was the time of his spiritual minority, when he came into the full use of his reason. And then sin revived, which had previously been dead. Thus with most expositors we translate the *ἔστι ψεῦδος*, and not "leibte wieder auf." In many *compositioes* the expression *ἐν ἡ* signifies only "auf," "him auf." Thus *ἀναβλάσκειν* means "aufspriessen" (sprout, spring up), *ἀναβλέπω*, "aufsehen" (look up), *ἀναβλέπω*, "aufblicken" (look up). Thus in the time, when Paul as a Pharisee stood and lived under the Law, was zealous for the Law, & would become righteous by the works of the Law, sin, the evil that was at the same time alive in him. The one does not exclude the other.

What the Apostle thus emphasizes in v. 8 b. 9 is, taken as a general axiom, that sin is dead, as long as man lives without the Law: but that sin revives when the Law comes. We must still clarify for ourselves, what this being dead & this revival of sin thro' the Law includes in itself. The being dead of sin one has, especially in earlier times, pointed to the fact that without the Law sin remained unknown & unrecognized to man, likewise did not terrify & cause anxiety to his conscience. Certainly man did not know sin according to its real essence, likewise knew nothing of evil, as long as the Law was a stranger to him. But the Apostle had already called special attention to that fact in v. 10. The expression which he now uses, *ψεῦδος ἐναγρία* *νεκρῶν*, states more. It is the remark very correctly to that: *ma hoc dicit: nam ita res comparatur, ut sine moris lege peccato mita et via et nervi dormit*. Without the Law sin lacks the real power of life, the real nerve of life. Sin dwells in man from his birth on & does not rest there somewhat like a dead seed of grain in the field of the heart; this is not the *tertium comparationis*, but rather it is like a infects & penetrates all the motions of life, also already of the minor child. Man, who is conceived & grows in sin, lives & dies from his birth, as long as he is not regenerated, with all his wishes & desires, with all his still unconscious & thoughtless comings & goings. But the real *nervus peccati*, the *nervus peccati* still first of all sleeps & is first active & begins to develop, when the Law comes. And this nerve of the life of sin is the conscious opposition against God & his will, the expressed opposition against God. When the Law enters into the will & consciousness of man, then man first of all recognizes sin as that which it is in itself, as a God-displeasing conduct, ^{but} that the other thing follows, that sin becomes alive & strong in him & shows itself.

death which draws after itself eternal death, hell & condemnation for the sinner. The foregoing statement is essentially identical with the sentence: "The law worketh wrath." 4, 5. And when the Law enters into his consciousness, conscience him of sins & transgression, & makes him, the evil but, alive in him, also begins to feel & discern something of the terror of death, of hell & of condemnation. But it also appears here that the Law in itself & by itself does not work such evil effect, but only per accidens in connection with sins. The sin which dwells in man is basically that which puts man to death even by means of the Law. "Denn indem die Sünde in uns nalmw am Keist, so sie mich betrogen und durch das Gesetz getödet" ("For in, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, & by it slew me"). ἡ γὰρ διαπρὶξ ἡ ὁμοιωσις ἡμεῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῇ εὐλογίᾳ, ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐλογίᾳ ἡν ἡμεῖς. v. 6. These words serve for the closer explanation of the preceding statement regarding the Law. Any place before the eyes of man the forbidden thing, joy & pleasure like the serpent lured the forbidden fruit by on the eyes of the woman, as desirable giving as a great happiness. But that is deceit; for the forbidden fruit hides death's condemnation in itself. And in that sin now under such misrepresentation turns the heart and mind of man to such things & thereby holds them firmly, concerning which the Commandment speaks, from which the Commandment would withhold man. "Thou shalt not covet." it brings death's condemnation to man by means of the Commandment.

"Ὁ οὖν ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ εὐλογία ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἄριστος." "Heiliger und dankbar heilig und gerecht und gut" ("Therefore the law is holy, the commandment holy, & just, & good"). 7, 12. That does not follow out of the foregoing amplification, but does not stand in opposition with it, same, much rather in harmony. With the previous that of the Law & the relationship of the Law to sin it continues to stand that the Law is not sin, but is holy. Yes, the Law in itself (ὁ μὲν νόμος) is holy, according to its entire content, in all its demands a mirror of God's holiness. The sum of the Law is: "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy." Lev. 19, 1. And every individual commandment is holy & just & good, demands of man only what is right & reasonable, good & praiseworthy. We understand with Philippius the εὐλογία of the moral good, not in the sense of "heileam" (salutary), "wohlthätig" (beneficial). "For in 7, 13 τὸ ἄριστος evidently represents the general, essential basic concept of the three predicates ἅγιος, ἵκος, and ἄνα ὁς, and in thereby appears more in fact, that it abuses the moral good, as if thereby that it permits that which brings salvation & turns it into corruption."

The summary of the instruction contained in 7, 7-12 concerning the Law & the effect of the Law is accordingly: The Law teaches (οὐκ) to know sin, works all evil but & helps to death. Still this harmful effect does not proceed from the Law in the last analysis, which in itself is good & holy, but from sin in which takes the Law into its service.

7, 13-25. The Struggle of the Regenerated.

Vv. 15-17.

Out of the foregoing the Apostle in 13 takes the following questions: "Hut nem deus hunc mihi quoniam hoc geordnet?" "Was then that which is good made death unto me?" "Hut the good brought death to me?" Still only to immediately reject it emphatically, & once again to strongly call attention to the fact that sin through the good has brought death to him. At the same time he names the deathly sin which had barely had in mind, sin which really appears as sin according to God's will, which was the intention of God, when He gave the Law to sinful man, in that it threw the good worked death in him, *ἵνα φανῇ ἡ ἀνομία διὰ τοῦ τοῦ νόμου καὶ ἡτοῦτο ἡ ἁμαρτία*. & even thereby the existence of sin shows itself, that it then misuses the good thing, the Law & throws the same put me to death & condemn me. And in this manner, through the commandment, sin should become even above measure, *ἵνα γένῃται καὶ ὑπερβολὴς ἀνομίας διὰ τοῦ νόμου*, sin has, and will, outdone itself, & it speaks with God, expresses a masterpiece of irony in that it looks & Law completely into its mirror & turned me to curse & condemnations. The sin intention, which God merely had in mind, was that, where sin had become evident & powerful, the grace of God should appear in a rather superior & unfolding as much the more powerfully. But of that that the Apostle says nothing in this passage, since here he was concerned only with the matter of bringing to light the contrast between the Law & sin.

This contrast he illustrates in the following with an experience which he himself had had with it. "Etenim visum est, docet deus sancti, quid sit id" ("For we know that the Law is spiritual"). Vv. 14. That is a truth well known to the Christians. They know the Law as the Law of God, *ὁ νόμος τοῦ θεοῦ*. The Law is *πνευματικός*, but proceeds from God, who is *πνεῦμα*, *θεὸς ἐστὶν πνεῦμα* (Theodoret), so it bears in itself the born nature of the *θεὸς πνεῦμα*. Therefore the Law is nothing else than the demand of God on man, thus its spiritual divine form shows itself in the fact that it demands a spiritual divine disposition, a holy, God-pleasing conduct from man. *Ἐπεὶ, ἰναὶ, καὶ πνευματικός, ἀσπιδισ, hoc est, non tantum requirit exteriorum disciplinam et honestatem, sed nult quique, ut corda nostra in spiritu vivant et habeant motus spirituales, placentes Deo, quales sunt vera fiducia in Deum, dilectio et timor Dei. Interioris enim est, non tantum ratione causae efficientis, quia a Deo est, sed etiam ratione causae materialis, quia spiritualis obsequium, non exteriorum solum, sed interiorum non membrorum tantum, sed etiam cordis est et spiritus obedientiam postulat.* Latin: "The Law is now, however, of a pneumatic nature & essence, insofar as it presents the ideal of a pneumatic man & would be fulfilled only by such a one. *ὁ ἁγίος*. "Selbstingenügen" bin, *φεισῆς* ("but I am carnal"), thus Paul confesses. "Ἐπισχέλι" ("carnal") in the strict sense of the word, "fleshly minded", "fleshly disposed" reads *σάρκα καὶ οὐκ ἔχει πνεῦμα*. For the Apostle uses the expression *σὰρκινος* in the same sense. I bear the form of the nature that is the meaning of the simple, corrupt flesh in me. Yes, *ὁ ἁγίος ἐν τῇ σάρτει* ("I am under sin"), *ἡ ἐν σάρτει*, *ἐν τῇ σάρτει*, thus a bondswoman of sin. Now far he is that he explains in the following sentences.

252,
7, 13-17.

"Denn was ich nicht bringe, kann ich nicht." ("for that which I do I follow not"). ὁ οὐκ ἔρχομαι, ὁ οὐκ ἔρχομαι. 11.5. Paul brings about what he hates, what he wills, thus the evil things, but even of that it he confesses: οὐκ ἔρχομαι. With that he does not mean, as De Wette, Frutke, Lobach, Meyer, Philippi & Lietz understand him, that it was lacking to him in correct recognition, in moral appraisals of that which he did, that he acted blindly, without a clear consciousness. For when he writes further that he would not, much rather hates, what he does, thus he is still conscious of the fact that that what he does is evil. But οὐκ ἔρχομαι also can yet mean: "I am an unaccountable riddle to myself in my actions," as, for example, Weiss would have it. On the other hand, the meaning non approbo, which older exegetes like Placcius, Koerner, and Scholz apply to the expression, is not demonstrable. Still the hypothesis as the verb ἔρχομαι in this connection evidently in the pregnant sense, concerning which Tremmer expresses himself in the following manner: "I know without analogy in profane Greek (still cf. ἔρχομαι, known, behind), but in the connection of its meaning well grounded is supported by the corresponding turn of the Hebrew וְיָ, in the pregnant sense, as it is in Matt. 23: οὐδ' ἔνοτε ἔγνων ἔνοτε. John 10: 11. ἔρχομαι τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ ἔρχομαι τὰ ἐμὰ, καὶ ἔρχομαι ἔρχομαι καὶ ἔρχομαι τὰ πατέρα (cf. 12: 25). 1. 24; 1 Cor. 7, 3; Gal. 4, 9; Phil. 3, 13; 1 Tim. 2, 14; 1 Pet. 5, 21. Cf. under οὐκ ἔρχομαι. It is clear that the negative expression in Matt. 23 would deny that, also the similar connection with the object, cf. Matt. 23, 26: οὐκ ἔρχομαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, in that the main condition of that connection would deny the acquaintance. Cf. 1 Cor. 5, 21: τὸν μὴ γινώσκοντες ἔρχομαι. It is a counterman, 'keine Ahnung haben von etwas, nicht wissen von etwas'. ... Contrary to that the positive ἔρχομαι τὰ ἐμὰ states that the basis of a connection, & with that immediately the connection itself is present, that the object is not strange to the subject, but is well known, is trusted. ... Thus ἔρχομαι in such a connection designates: 'I demand to be considered as' (to give someone consideration), 'mit jemandem eine Verbindung anknüpfen' (to enter into a league with someone), or to stand in such a league. Cf. Grimm: "ἔρχομαι = to recognize as mine." It is evident that in 1 Cor. 5, 21 the expression τὸν μὴ γινώσκοντες ἔρχομαι can say nothing else than that Christ does not have the slightest communion with sin, that it was completely strange & unfamiliar to him. And thus Hofmann gives the exegesis of the οὐκ ἔρχομαι in our passage very correctly in that he writes: "Of that which he fulfills or accomplishes he (Paul) denies that it is an object of the understanding, namely, of that understanding, which inclusion of the object in the inwardness of the one is order & there is without a connection of the first with the latter is not possible. Thus he denies that a communion exists between that which he accomplishes & between his inward life. A stranger, because it is an unfamiliar thing to him. That that which he accomplishes is strange & unfamiliar to him inwardly proceeds itself in the fact that he fulfills that which he does not will, even does that which he hates & abhors. That which he accomplishes contradicts the inclination of his will, is repugnant to him inwardly. The contrast between action & will comes into expression very sharply & strongly in the hieredyn. synonyms κατέργαζεν ἔργον, ποιεῖν ἔργον. On the one hand, and οὐκ ἔρχομαι, οὐκ ἔρχομαι, ἔρχομαι on the other hand.

That the Apostle understands that under the being sold under sin, that he cannot do what is himself willing but must do that which is inwardly strange & repugnant to him, that he must accommodate himself to a strange will. Sin is his master, & it is impossible for him to withhold himself from the obedience to sin. Quod modum non regis et servi tributur, qui volunt, et servi sunt, qui obediencia voluntati vivere coguntur, ita apostolus regis et testatur ab immanis pravitatis, unde ipse etiam nihil minus abhorreat. Still the being sold under sin & being bound to sin cannot now or ever be regarded as a real coercion. It is to be considered what Fabius remarks here: locutionem semper expisio: sponte enim peccamus, quia peccatum non coact, nisi voluntarium. Sed addicti sumus isto peccato, et nihil sponte possumus nisi peccare; quia malitia, quae in nobis dominatur, huc nos rapit. But Augustine writes: Semper autem et in nobis voluntas libera, sed non semper ad bona, sed enim a justitia libera est, quando servit peccato, et tunc est mala, cum a peccato libera est, quando servit justitiae, et tunc est bona. Sin always has its habitation in the will of man. The one who always sins sins with a will, sponte, voluntarie, otherwise there would be no sin. Sin according to its essence is the inclination of the will which is contrary to God. Also every evil act comes forth from a voluntaneous act of the will, otherwise it would not be evil. Thus we must here distinguish a double will, the will which is bound to sin & is active in the fulfillment of evil, & the will which strives against sin & hates & abhors the evil. The captivity & servitude over which Paul complains accordingly consists in this, that he, because he bears the flesh in himself, cannot always avoid willing in the evil & fulfilling the evil contrary to his own better knowledge & his own better will.

From what has been said it follows that Paul on his part approves the Law & declares it good. "Wenn ich aber das thue, was ich nicht will, so stimme ich dem Gesetz zu, das es gut ist" ("I do that which I would not, & consent unto the Law that it is good"), οὐ συμφωνῶ τῷ νόμῳ, ὅτι καλός. v. 16. It is meaning is not that he agrees with the judgment concerning the Law contained in the Law, with such a statement of the Law as Gal. 3:12: "And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes & judgments so righteous as all this Law?" but that he agrees with the Law in general, stands in harmony with the same, & testifies that it is good & excellent. That he does even by the fact that he himself does not will that which the Law forbids him.

Out of the circumstance that he himself does not will what he does, it presents itself further: Νὺν δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ὃ οἰκοῦμαι ἐν ἐμοὶ ἡμαρτία. "Now aber or I do no longer bring it as nicht mehr, sondern die Bünde, die in mir wohnen" ("Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me"). v. 17. Both the Νὺν δὲ as well as the οὐκέτι is to be taken logically, the latter of that which can no longer

) be considered or maintained according to that which has been said. This self, his ἐγώ, to which Paul calls special attention, is not that which accomplishes the evil, but the sin dwelling in him. It is himself does not will the evil, but he hates it from his heart. Himself is not the real transgressor but sin. Certainly the sin dwells in me, ἐν ἐμοὶ, does not lie outside of the ἐγώ; I have the sin in me, I am the one who sins, not others. But it is not myself, which fulfills the sin, My real self stands in opposition to sin. This last sentence says nothing more concerning

254.
7, 13-17.

the Law. The apology of the Law is concluded with v. 15. The contrast of the Law & sin the Apostle has led over to another contrast, that of his self's sin. And with this latter contrast he would continue longer, to which he has aimed in this foregoing section.

The above expounded passage, 7, 13-17, gives content enough to decide the question, in which sense there was of every divided opinion, whether Paul in the entire context, 7, 13-25, speaks of that which he experienced before his conversion, or of that which he now, since he is a Christian, continually experiences in himself, in other words, whether he in his own example here describes the condition of the unregenerated or the condition of the regenerated. The Greek fathers found in the entire section the unregenerated. Even so Augustine in his earlier time; still in the course of the Pelagianistic controversies he changed his viewpoint & from that time on with all energy for the fact that here the S of the regenerated was speaking. The Augustinian interpretation then entered into the Church of the Reformation, while most of the Papists, though the Socinians & Unitarians followed the Greek fathers. We record here by way of instance only one passage from his exposition of Gal. 5, 17: "In this manner he (Paul) speaks of himself, in Rom. 7, 14: 'I am carnal, sold under sin'; & afterwards in v. 23: 'I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind', etc.; likewise v. 24: 'O wretched man that I am.' Here not only the Sophists labor themselves anxiously, but also some of the fathers, how they might defend Paul. For they consider it as disgraceful that it would be said that this chosen vessel of Christ should have sin. We present the words of Paul's, faithfully, in which he openly confesses that he was sold under sin, was taken captive by sin, that he had a Law which acted against him, that according to the flesh he served the law of sin. Here they answer again that the Apostle speaks this in the person of the godless. The godless do not complain about the opposition (rebellion), the struggle, & the servitude of sin, because sin rules mightily in them. Therefore this complaint is very correctly essentially that of Paul & of all saints. Therefore those have dealt not only unskillfully, but also godlessly who accused Paul & others whom he has said that they have no sin. For with this assertion, which has arisen from an ignorance of the doctrine of faith, they have robbed the Church of the greatest comfort, destroyed the forgiveness of sins, & made Christ superfluous." The Lutheran Confession likewise referring frequently to Rom. 7, 14-25 and see the sins as proof for the fact that the old Adam still clings to the believer in this life, as descriptions of the daily repentance & contrition of the Christians, which continues until death." Mueller, hym. 3, p. 671, 315. This is also the unanimous opinion of all later Lutheran theologians. In the "Lutheran controversy" the Leipzig opinion on Rom. 7 remarks: *nam etiam iustitiae naturalis inclinatione magis propendit ad malum quam ad bonum.* Even so on the Reformed side have Zwingli, Bullinger, Calvin & their followers understood this passage. In the time of Calvin the matter changed. While Geneva still remained with the interpretation of the Reformation the later Calvinists returned to the pre-Augustinian interpretation. This latter was then adopted also by his Rationalists & today is firmly held & defended by most modern theologians, for example, Blandin, Nitzsch, Dehmann, J. Mueller, H. Luck, Goss, Beck, Habmaier, Meier, Weiss, Koelt & others. The Augustinians

which is a correct interpretation of his theory, Davidson, Fodor & Hodge have concerned with Prof. Mann.

How many & fathered God for a mediating application, for they were not in Rom. 7:14. Paul everywhere describes his Christianity present time still much as way that he looks away from his communion of life with Christ, thus from the fact that he is a Christian. Against this Schott remarks very fittingly: "What concerns the latter opinion, I must not, I understand it, the unregeneration would not in unbelief, give a twofold worse condition, an entirely natural one, & that regeneration a twofold one. He can't be one growing out of the communion of life with Christ - a difference which seems not in opposition to accomplish." This abstraction, to speak with Schott, is a casus non dubius. & Philip's judges correctly: "I am in Christ and portray that which is outside of Christ, thus do not portray in concrete what I really am, but only what I was outside of Christ." In the second half of the 7. chapter his brother criticizes concrete experience of conversion, & this is either the 3rd of the unregenerated or the 3rd of the regenerated. Testimonium non pictum. En route of the foundation, also the exclamation which Schott endorses, according to his example of Bucer and Hitzsche, designates as the "one tenable," namely, "whether the one's belong to the community of saints of the Old Testament speaks, & certainly out of the condition which has come upon him after he in his 3rd had become sinful, but thereby had also arrived at a knowledge of sin." For also in the sphere of the Old Testament communion of saints there was only a twofold class of men, unregenerated & regenerated. Thus it is & remains here the eterna controversia, whether Paul in Rom. 7:13-25 speaks in his name of the regenerated or of the unregenerated.

Those expositors who find the unregenerated in the foregoing section appear to be fact that the same is
spoken here as in 7, 7-12. But in vv. 12-13 Paul speaks of himself 'thrust in the past tense, in vv. 13-20 thrust in
the present. Thus in the first part he describes his pre-Christian state, in the latter part his Christian conversion. The
text offers no support for the notion that the Greek only brings home to our mind his state in v. 12. And that
which he states here regarding himself absolutely does not apply to the unregenerated. "Conscience to natural un-
converted man the willing of good, the hatred of evil, agreement with the law is pure. Platonism. To speak
with the Augustine, the natural man has only "in some measure a free will to live honorably outwardly and to
choose between the things which the reason comprehends." He can prefer that which is outwardly honorable
to that which is dishonorable. But he is unable to do anything in spiritual matters. "The carnal mind is enmity
against God." Rom. 8, 7. The natural man wills & loves nothing, but hates & abhors only everything that is God's
But God wills & loves. Thus he abhors the law of God, which is spiritual & divine. It brings the good that

) man wills & loves the good because it is good & well-pleasing to God, is a characteristic of the Christian. Only in the Christian, who are renewed by the Spirit of God, does God work not only the accomplishment but also the willing of the good. Phil. 2, 13. Now Paul certainly experiences that he does not do the good that he wills, but much rather, he wills that which he does not will, the evil. But this discord between the willing & doing, this duplicity of the I and the willing, as it is already portrayed in 1, 2-14, is of course only in a Christian.

who is born anew, thus to die again, but is still not completely renewed, but still has sin dwelling in himself, still bears the flesh, the old man in himself. Kierkegaard remarks on Rom. 7, 15: *Sacra Scriptura docet in homine non converso unum tantum esse voluntatem, in renato autem duam. Voluntas in renato renovata non modo potest nihil ad committenda ad malum et committere; non solum, et potest et a se ipsis obviare. Nec, sed etiam nihil aliud vult et potest, quam dissentire et repugnare bono. Haec voluntas est vera veteris hominis, et quoniam manet etiam in renato, quamdiu vivunt, est tamen perpetua coactio in male non renata, et aversio voluntatis a se et ad malum conversio. In homine autem renato duplex voluntas est, vetus et nova. Vetus non penitus mutatur, tollitur aut renovatur sed aliquo modo mortificatur et reprimatur. Nova voluntas est creata a spiritu sancto in mente, et est homo novus, sunt novi motus, excitati a spiritu, placentes Deo, et haec nova voluntas vult et probat, quae spiritus vult, assensit et assensit Deo. The advocates of the contrary opinion refer to the expressions of ancient heathens, which also already speak of a conflict between willing & doing, for example, Epict. Enchir. 1, 26, 1: $\delta \mu \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$ ($\delta \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \omega \varsigma$) $\omicron \upsilon \pi \omicron \iota \epsilon \iota$, $\kappa \alpha \iota \delta \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$ $\tau \omicron \iota \epsilon \iota$; Eurip. Med. 1079: $\sigma \upsilon \pi \omicron \delta$, $\delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$ ($\sigma \tau \alpha \rho \chi \eta$) $\tau \omega \varsigma$ $\epsilon \mu \omega \varsigma$ ($\rho \omicron \nu \theta \epsilon \nu \alpha \nu \tau \omega \varsigma$); Or. M. 1, 7, 19: *Vide maliora proboque, deteriores sequor.* But this striving between the better willing & the power of material nature, which puts all good resolutions to shame, moves itself in natural man only in the natural sphere. The natural man really often leans toward that which is outwardly honorable, but then, overcome by the evil desire, still does that which is shameful. Of that the Epology writes: (Check the agenda for savage, c. 934 in *Romans*) This experience of the natural man is something entirely different from the experience of the Christian, the struggle between the spirit & the flesh, the conflict between the renewed & the sinful dwelling in him, of which Paul speaks in Rom. 7. *Videtur* huc *Medea*, *proit aut quicquid hic geminum avertit huc collectit*. *Proit* non enim *de appetitu sensitivi ad verum intellectum ingens, nec de rationis et voluntatis contentione, quam homo renatus experientur; cum ea, quae non probant mente, elidunt tamen et coarctant voluntatis extensum atque; sed de suggestivis et carnalis, quae non cum debet nisi in renato, hic dicere videtur, quod exemplo apostoli satis constat, siquidem de semet ipso loquatur. Caloni.**

But how? Are there not expressions in the foregoing section, even already in the first passage 1, 13-17, which portray the sinfulness which still clings to the Christian in all too strong & dark colors? Does the statement: "I am carnal, sold under sin," really apply to the regenerated? That does already, with reference to this $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ $\upsilon \pi \delta \tau \eta \nu \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu$. Just as: $\tau \omicron \upsilon \pi \rho \delta \tau \eta \nu \chi \alpha \rho \iota \tau \omicron \varsigma$ $\kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \upsilon \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ $\epsilon \iota \varsigma \delta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$. He also writes: "Already these unlimited predication, which are the strongest, must be expressed in contrast to the $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, are supposed to have been said of, to be contained of the regenerated man, of the condition in the state of grace." "Indeed, if all the following can be said of the regenerated, then the regenerated would be like the unregenerated." To that kind of objection Hodge replies: "There is no necessity for denying that Paul here speaks of himself & describes the experience of a renewed man. There is not an expression, from beginning

to the end of this section, which the boldest man may not want to admit. "It must have been a moment of forgetfulness, that such a man as Tholuck could quote with approbation the assertion of H. L. Harre: 'This opinion has most pitifully & shamefully, not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but also ruined its influence, & disgraced its character.' What lamentable blindness to notorious facts does such language evince! From the days of Job & David to the present hour, the boldest men have been the most ready to acknowledge & deplore the existence & power of indwelling sin.' Certainly, it is nothing but foolishness & blindness, when one would so judge, that such a conclusion as this: 'I am sold under sin' would disgrace the Christian's Christianity. Thiers calls those oppositors who here suppose that Paul speaks here in the person of the godless: 'Apathetic, who have experienced no violent temptations.' For such oppositors have experienced very little or nothing of the power of sin & of grace, to whom is lacking all spiritual sense & understanding. Verily, the godless do not complain about their servitude, as Thiers calls attention to it in the above quotations. 'But I am carnal, sold under sin.' For what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do.' That is, as Luther says, the complaint of Paul: all saints but saints all true children of God, who are renewed & sanctified by the Spirit of God, also recognize what a loathsome & horrible thing sin is, which still dwells in them & makes them to walk in step, & lament the fact that they are still in carnal. In confession of repentance of Paul & all saints rings out again in the hymns of ministers of the Church. The Church of God sings & teaches all her members to sing: *Leb ich bin ein Kind der Sünden, ach wie weilt und brüt; es ist nicht an mir zu finden, als mir ungerecht ist; all mein Sündthun, all mein Thörichtum, all mein Böse, all mein Verachten, böse ich, gottlos und gar und sehr gottlos in mörder. Herr, ich muss es ja bekennen, dass nichts Besseres wohnt in mir; das zwar, was wir wollen nennen, soll ich meinen, das ist, aber nicht und das zu sündigen und das Bute zu vollbringen, soll ich gar nicht, wie es soll, was ich nicht will, das ich will.*"

Still one must correctly understand what is meant when one says of a Christian, that he is sold under sin. It is something different than the servitude of sin, into which the natural man has fallen. An unconverted man is ruled completely by sin; sin forces out of him shame & hate & works, 5, 19-21, and all the while in some manner lives an honorable life, still it is sin, unbelief, pride, self-righteousness, selfishness, which determines all his actions. The servitude, on the other hand, of which Paul & all saints complain, consists according to the above remarks in the fact that the renewed & the renewed will cannot carry through what it might, that the regenerated, because he is still carnal, must still accommodate & bow himself to a strange will, the will of the sin which dwells in him. What Paul expresses in the second half of the 7. chapter in no way contradicts what he had written in the 6. chapter regarding the Christian's freedom from sin. It supplements & completes here only the description of the sanctification of the Christian. A believing Christian once who is regenerated, is dead to sin, is inwardly free & unencumbered by sin. He also does not permit sin to reign in his mortal body; he avoids shame & abominations; sinning with him is not his habit. Nevertheless he complains & laments over the fact that he does that which he does not will, much rather hates & abhors. Truly he still sins plentifully.

258.
7, 18-20

Out of his heart there still continually arise wicked thoughts, impure desires. And even also these acts & motions
internally belong to the actions of the evil. He does he expects it, he has spoken a word, which he is then sorry
for, has done something of which he then wishes that had not happened. But the best will he cannot prevent
that sin still mixes itself into everything. A believing Christian, a regenerated person really stands in a
new spiritual, divine existence & life, & that shows itself also in conduct. He brings forth to God, exercises
himself daily in good works. Nevertheless he still laments & confesses that he does not do that which he
wills. His action always remains behind his willing. He can never be entirely satisfied with his actions.
He must also note much incompleteness in his best works. That is his daily complaint: "That is my sorrow,
which troubles me, that I cannot love thee sufficiently as I should love thee." And also his love of his
neighbour is still very weak & defective. Of that our Confession writes: "How then the entire holy, Christian
Church, all the saints of all times have confessed & still confess: For thus Paul speaks to the Romans in 7, 18:
'The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.' Similarly: 'With the flesh I serve
the law of sin.' For there is no one who thus fears & loves God the Lord from the whole heart as he is obligated, no
one who bears cross & tribulation in complete obedience over against God, no one who does not often doubt
thru weakness whether God also accepts us, whether He connects us, whether He hears our prayer. Over that
we often murmur out of impatience against God, that it goes well with the godless, evil will be the
devout. Similarly, who is there who performs his calling well enough, who does not rise in anger against God
in temptations, when God hides Himself? Who loves his neighbor as himself?" Mueller, Luth. B. 3, 117. Anbort,
a devout Christian might very gladly avoid all sin & do only that which pleases God, & completely fulfill God's
will; but that is absolutely impossible for him, because sin & the flesh still cling to him & he cannot possibly,
as long as he lives on earth, lay aside the flesh entirely. In the time of life he does not escape from the discussion
between willing & doing, out of the controversy between flesh & spirit. This is his present captivity.

V. 18-20.

The foregoing amplification repeats itself here essentially, except that modifying statements were added to
the individual expressions. Here also the dual nature of the Christian is portrayed. Therefore this paragraph,
which is added with v. 18, serves as an illustration & confirmation of the preceding. These verses contain an
amplification & confirmation of the sentiment of the preceding verse. They re-assert the existence & explain the
nature of the inward struggle of which the apostle had been speaking. Hodge. While the apostle has
previously spoken in general of the fact that sin dwell in him, ὁ σῶμα ἐστί μοι σαρξ & ὁ σῶμα ἐστί μοι σαρξ, he now writes
more definitely, in that he expressly asserts his Christian consciousness. ὁ σῶμα γὰρ, ὁ σῶμα οὐκ ὁ σῶμα ἐστί μοι.
τὸ τῆς ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου, ἀπὸ τοῦ σῶματος. "Wenn ich weis, dass ich nicht, das ich in mir, das ich nicht,
nicht ist, weil" ("For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing). V. 18. He has as he still

had the flesh in himself, nothing good, but solely evil dwelt in him. "Who here the restriction $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$, which is added to $\epsilon\iota\mu\omicron\iota$, shows that Paul can only speak of the regenerated. In me that is in my flesh, dwells nothing good (nothing better), I utter, says that in his real $\epsilon\upsilon$ something good really does dwell. And certainly this good can only be the pneumatic nature itself, which is so named in the highest sense & corresponds to the pneumatic $\mu\omicron\mu\omicron\epsilon\sigma$, so that under the real $\epsilon\upsilon$, to which the $\epsilon\upsilon$ is $\epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ is contracted, only the $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$, the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ can be meant. Philippi. $\epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ stands here, 1, 5, 14, and as often in the New Testament in the classical sense & signifies the corrupt nature of man. Man is by nature & birth, flesh, entirely corrupt, & even the most noble powers & faculties of man, reason & will, are corrupt. And now even the regenerate still have the flesh in himself, they also have the not good side, the corrupt understanding & will, & so on. This is not only in some of the Christians, but also in every Christian, but also erroneous, foolish, wrong, corrupt, heretical, & in various opinions of men. Likewise in the flesh of the Christian there dwells no good thing, the flesh of the Christian is no better than the flesh of all the other children of men. This shows itself in the fact that in his Christian life with, namely, the willing of the good, is at hand, his doing, in exemptio est, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ even according to inner manifest that he does not find the accomplishment of the good. 1. 15b. "Until he looks around himself, as it were, in the area of his inward itself, he finds the $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ of the good lying before him, contrary to the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\delta\omicron\varsigma$, after which he looks around him searchingly, & must say $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$, I find it not, which means, I know not where it is, it is not there." But the meaning is not that he believes always & has only a completely ineffective desire, but that he also in his best actions in that sin is intermingled with them, does not fulfill the act, which corresponds to his will, which is sanctified by the Spirit of God." Philippi. Moreover, the sense remains the same, even if one does not read the $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$, which nevertheless is sufficiently attested. This statement the Apostle explains in 1. 19, in that he repeats, as it were, the statement of 1. 15, which has become an axiom, only in a, better form, with a more express addition of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ and $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\omicron\varsigma$: "Herr nicht das Gute, das ich will, thue ich, sondern das Böse, das ich nicht will, das thue ich." "For the good that I would I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do." We are once more reminded that, as the willing of the good is not entirely ineffective, so the doing of the evil also includes in itself the inner acts & motions of the perverted, fleshly will. From the fact that I do that which I do not will, it follows, however, that it is not my own real self, which fulfills that which is evil, but the sin which dwells in me, i. e. Thus also this deduction the Apostle brings to expression the second time & thereby emphatically gives the Christian to consider that in this conflict between

(The $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ and the $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\alpha\pi\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ the former predominates & prevails, that the renewed self is the real self of the Christian.

The first question is: How is the statement: $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omega\ \lambda\gamma\alpha\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\nu\ \epsilon\tau\iota\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$, in vv. 21-23, combined & explained? The expression $\tau\omicron\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is understood by a considerable number of expositors as the Mosaic Law; but the entire statement with this interpretation of $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is pointed out very differently. The Greek fathers & among the later ones, for example, Bengel, Klemm, & Thoma, none true & explain: "Thus I find the Law for me, to which I am willing, to do the good, because the evil lies near me, which means, I find the Law, inasmuch as I have to will to do the good, stands by my side definitely, because the evil lies close to me & therefore I find the Law as a $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$ and an $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ (Charyseum). Against this Meyer remarks very correctly, that the thought, which would according to that be given by the Dative $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, could be expressed more vividly & emphatically than by the simple Dative $\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$. If man in the same takes $\epsilon\tau\iota\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ as the basic declaration, the first part of the verse thus as the principle clause, takes $\tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ as predicate to $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omega\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$, allows $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$ depend on $\tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\nu$, and here finds an expression which proves, that the speaker recognizes the Law, namely, for that which is good to him who would do it. However, he discovers it thus, because the evil is at hand to him: "When he comes to act, then the evil is there & presents itself to him, so that he does it. But his willing is not a willing of the evil but of the good. Now since the Law forbids the evil & commands the good, therefore he finds that it is the good to him who would do it. The contrast between that which he wills & that which is at hand to him, permits him to become aware of the agreement between his willing & the Law, permits him to perceive that he does that which he wills, when he does that which the Law commands. Thus the knowledge grows in him that it is the Law which he should do as one who wills the good; but out of the said condition there arises for him the fact that the evil lies so directly near to him." But this he with could hardly have expressed his thoughts more fastidiously. Thus Schubert judges. And he asks: Can one imagine a more complicated thought & a more affected construction than this? Especially is it an act of violence to separate $\tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ from $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$ and to combine it with $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omega\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$. What is more, this explanation, like the foregoing also, contradicts the repererum. The statement of that kind concerning the Law, such a justification of the Law lies completely outside of the context. With the information that the Law is not evil but good & holy, the apostle had long before made a mensura. Directly in vv. 14-17, he speaks of the Law without reference to the Law, from v. 17 on, he describes the duplicity of him, the contrast between his willing & doing. And that is evidently also the reigning thought in the passage, vv. 21-23. With this basic thought of the entire section a third conception, to which I likewise, first of all, & others -- pleased, would suit this translation: "Ich finde also bei mir, das ich das Böse tun muss, weil ich das Gute will." But a double object with $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$ appears inadmissible, & the expression $\tau\omicron\nu\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$ is not found otherwise. Meyer also calls attention to that.

certainly, he only strong theme the grammatical crudeness & difficulty, in that he explains on his part: "I had find, while my mind is turned toward the Law, in order to do the good, that the evil lies before me." It is unbelievable that with the singular expressions τὸν νόμον θεῶν Paul is supposed to have designated "the moral interest, the desire & love for the Law." In short, one cannot reasonably tell the Moral Law in the statement in 1.21. And so with most of the expositors, for example, Luther, Bizer, Calvin, Bultmann, Holmbeck, Ruck, Hodge, Philippi, Kodet, Edwards, Weiss & Fichtelberg, we take τὸν νόμον in the general sense of rule, as, for example, in 7, 23. In the following verses the expression νόμος is used in different meanings. And it appears to me as the most natural thing to combine the active τὸ θεῶν εὐδοκῶν with ἀγαπῶμαι & to take or grant a projection of the stressed dative or object, which then brings with it the repetition of the εὐδοκῶν after 7. Thus there presents itself in simpler form the simple plain thought: "I had find the rule, that the evil lies near at hand to me, who would do the good. I would gladly do the good, but the evil lies so close to me, presents itself to me, & mingles into all my comings & goings. That is essentially the same thing that the Law the had already previously amplified, the Law now take the Law not as a real particle of a situation but as one of reactivation. Luther interprets this in the εὐδοκῶν τὸν νόμον. The hostile emphasis is that this experience of him, of which he had previously spoken, was no exception, but the rule, his daily experience. Very significantly this experience is called a rule, even because it expresses no accident & passing, but a necessary & continuing phenomenon." Philippi.

The double statement in 1.21 contains the result, in which the foregoing amplification reflects itself. But the opposite adds to this double statement an explanation, 1.22-23, which brings the duplicity of his & to the strongest expressions. 1.22 corresponds to the first half of the 21. verse: Ἐὐδοκῶ ὡς καὶ τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀνθρώπου. "Dem ich freue mich an dem Gesetz Gottes nach dem inneren Menschen." "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." We translate: "Ich freue mich an dem Gesetz Gottes" and not: "Ich freue mich mit dem Gesetz Gottes." It is an all too strong personification & presents a difficult thought, when one ascribes joy to the Law. To want to deny that & is in such combinations as εὐδοκῶ τὸν νόμον, εὐδοκῶ τὸν θεόν, εὐδοκῶ τὸν νόμον, can also have the sense of designating the delight & sorrow over something as the corresponding former manner of the share which one takes therein, is simply incomprehensible in view of the idiom. Hofmann. G. H. Eusebius, 19, 23. Epigrades, Hipp. 1250. 1270. Herodot 294. ὁ θεὸς ἂν εὐδοκῶν, is in itself the inner man, the inward part of man, the thinking, willing, feeling, & perception of the man. Still according to the context, since here delight in God's Law is attributed to the inner man & the flesh, sin is regarded as a con-

tract. In our passage the concept ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου appears as identical with the concept ὁ κατὰ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀνθρώπου. In the regeneration above all the inner part of man - heart, understanding & will - are renewed. In the same sense the expression ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου is used in 11 Cor. 4, 16 and the expression ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου in Eph. 3, 16. According to the inward or new man Paul & every regenerated one has his heartfelt desire & delight in the Law of God, even because it is God's, because it is good, spiritual, divine, because it reveals the unchangeable,

holy will of God. And how gladly he would follow the Law of God in all its parts!

— "Aber", and that is now the other side, the correlate of v. 21 b, "aber ich erblicke in anderen Gesetz in meinen Gliedern, das da widerstreitet dem Gesetz meines Sinnes und mich zefangen nimmt und das Gesetz der Sünde, welches ist in meinen Gliedern." ("But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, & bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members"), $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\kappa\lambda\omega\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\iota\chi\ \mu\alpha\lambda\omega\tau\iota\ \gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\ \tau\alpha\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omicron\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\upsilon\tau\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. V. 23. Paul mentions another law, $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$, which is an entirely different kind than the Law of God. And this other law he calls a law in his members. We combine $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\omicron\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ with $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$, corresponding to the $\tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\upsilon\tau\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ at the close of the verse. Under the law in the members we do not understand, as it is frequently taken, the power of the material nature or the selfish impulses, from which the believer is overcome, held captive & made impotent. This explanation is connected with the basic error of the modernists, as if the Apostle in this entire section describes the moral condition of the natural, unconverted man. On the other hand, we do not, as, for example, Philippi according to the matters of older exegetes, include under the $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega$ also the higher powers & faculties of man, like understanding & will, so far as these are still not renewed by the Spirit of God. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota$ means simply "the member", "the members", "the members of the body, nothing further. The "law in the members" & "the members" are two things. The "law in the members" the Apostle defines himself, where he repeats the expression as "the law of sin", $\sigma\iota\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omicron\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon$. The law of sin is sin itself, as a norm, insofar as it seeks to decide the actions of the man. Now sin does not really have its real habitation: its real root in the body & in the members of the body, but in the inner parts of man, in the heart, understanding & will. That applies also to the sin which still dwells in the believing Christians, whose heart, mind, understanding & will are still not entirely renewed. That also applies to the sin which still dwells in the believing Christians. Their heart, mind, understanding & will are still not entirely renewed. But the perverted mind & will, which still remains in the regenerated, is powerful and often also, even in the members of the body, are able to take possession of the members & force them to do evil. Christians experience that every day, how his members incline to sin, how they are drawn to that even with a hidden power. And even therein he observes the law of sin.

— If the law of sin, the law in the members, the Apostle states, further on that lies the emphasis in our verse: $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\kappa\lambda\omega\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\ \tau\omega\ \sigma\upsilon\tau\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\iota\chi\ \mu\alpha\lambda\omega\tau\iota\ \gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon$ etc., "das da widerstreitet dem Gesetz meines Sinnes und mich zefangen nimmt und das Gesetz der Sünde, welches ist in meinen Gliedern" etc. ("warring against the law of my mind & bringing me into captivity" etc.). Then when he was about to fulfill the Law of God, in which he had his desire, is now this other ~~enemy~~ law as an armed enemy which opposed him, took the field against him, barred the way to him, by all powers hindered the fulfilling of the good. The law of sin resists & opposes the Law of God, for sin is the living of the will which is contrary to God, with that, however, at the same time "the law of my mind". $\sigma\iota\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omicron\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon$ entirely with the concept $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$, includes the entire inner life of man, thinking, willing, feeling and

[illegible]

Finally we point to the fact that also our Lutheran Confession represents throughout parts of the foregoing section, 2, 11-23, to the struggle of sanctification, which begins with conversion. "But when man is converted, & is thus enlightened, & his sin is removed, it is then that man, with what is good & better as he is, regenerate (or a new man) & delights in the law of God after the inward man; Rom. 7, 26, and henced with doing good to such an extent & as long as he is impelled by God's Spirit. ... And nevertheless (that also, the strife) of the flesh & spirit) remains in the regenerate of which St. Paul wrote, (Rom. 7, 23 ff.): 'I do delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, & bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.' (Aug. 9, 804-5. "Now, there remains, nevertheless, also in the regenerate, an obstinacy (a certain rebelliousness) of which the Scripture speaks, namely, that, 'the flesh lusteth against the spirit,' Gal. 5, 17, likewise, that 'fleshly

lute was against the soul, 1 Pet. 2, 11, and that 'the law in the members was against the law of the mind,' Rom. 7, 23. Accordingly, the man who is not regenerate resists God altogether, and is entirely a servant of sin, Gal. 3, 24; Rom. 6, 16. The regenerate person, however, delights in the law of God as to the inward man, but nevertheless sees in his members the law of sin, which wars against the law of the mind; on this account he serves the law of God with his mind, but with the flesh the law of sin, Rom. 7, 25." Trig. P. 212-13.

V. 24, 25.

The Epistle has come to an end with the theme of the section, with the description of Christian sanctification as a struggle with sin. We can call this amplification of this, in which he speaks of the sin dwelling in him, as remarked above, the confession of penance of Paul & of all saints. And this confession of penance dies away in a cry of lamentation & a cry for help. The cry of lamentation reads: Ταλαιπώρος ἔγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "Ich elender Mensch!" ("Wretched man that I am"). The regenerate person experiences the previously depicted servitude of sin as the greatest misery, the greatest distress on earth. The cry for help reads: τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; We translate it, in that we combine τοῦ σώματος with τοῦ θανάτου: "Wer wird mich erretten von diesem Leib des Todes" (11. V. "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"). The Christian however who is delivered & delivered, knows that the same shall finally deliver him also from all evil & also from the sin which still clings to him. The sense of the question is: Is that the hour of deliverance were already here? The Christian yearns for deliverance "von diesem Leib des Todes", from this body of lying which he still carries on himself, which belongs to death, from his "mortal body", 5, 12, which, because it is so weak & frail, is also such a weak, inhuman organ of the spirit, & is so easily servile to sin. He longs for the time, when he in glorified body can live to & serve God freely & unhindered. To the cry for help there is added a cry of thanks: Ἐὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἵψους τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. V. 25a. This reading, which 17 Kk offer, appears more certified than the other, which still can come into question, which is offered by G. 12 p 16. τῷ Θεῷ. The sense in both cases is the same. Paul and every believing Christian expresses thanks to God through Jesus Christ, our Lord. The giving of thanks of a man is a comfortable service, & at the same time it is not stated why & for what a Christian thanks God. The following statement in v. 25 b names the basis & the circumstance of the thanksgiving. ἡ γὰρ οὖν οὐ τὸ ἐμὲν τῷ μὲν νοῦν δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας. These words contain a short recapitulation of the entire foregoing amplification, still this recapitulation is so contained, that one recognizes how a Christian, who becomes his present status quo and wishes to be freed from it, still on the other hand has reason to give thanks for that. Most of the modern expositors place v. 25 b in

contrast to v. 25a and have the right to say, that in Christ when he regards his relationship to Christ, he really has reason to thank God; on the other hand, he himself, confined to his own person, 23-25; $\epsilon\gamma\omega$, aside from Christ, finds himself even in that unfortunate situation, that he still serves the flesh, when he also comes back with his mind. But in this manner, looking away from the entire erroneous comprehension of the whole passage, that cry of thanks is isolated & downright ununderstandable. But Thomasius we understand the $\alpha\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\epsilon\gamma\omega$, like the stressed $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ in v. 14 and v. 17, of the act 3. That is certainly thankworthy that the Christian with his real thanks, with his renewed mind, serves God & the law of God, even though with the flesh he still serves the law of sin. The grammatical coordination of the two members of the sentence in v. 25b by means of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ and $\delta\epsilon$ does not hinder laying the emphasis on the first member & referring the strengthening of the δ , the $\alpha\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\epsilon\gamma\omega$, only to this first proposition. Thus a Christian in his present temptation over sin, he is not forgetful that he is & was a Christian? Thank God that, even Christ, over for, to whom he owes his present, still subordinated condition of a Christian.

The expounded passage, 7, 12-15, as it has been treated here, completes the section which the writer had previously sketched of the sanctification of the Christian. What he has written in 7, 1-6 in the

beginning of Chap. 7 regarding that, that the Christians are free from all sin & thus in this way only an unwise person could want to say that a Christian can & must be completely, & do so already in this life. Certainly this misunderstanding is already excluded by the manner of speech, as 9:1: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body." For, as a notation & expression of sin, this sin remains in the Christian like his hostile opponent, expressly that Methodist opinion regarding complete sanctification & shows in our passage that not absolute sinlessness, but the struggle between sin & spirit, the battle with the indwelling sin is a characteristic of the Christian. It is obvious how this knowledge is offered, that the Christians maintain the comfort of the right faith, that it never occurs their mind that they are justified before God & are saved only by grace. Even the holiest man, King David, is lost, when in quarto critico, in the judgment of God he depends on his own works, his own doings. For there they do not stand the test. The summary of the section accordingly is:

The hostile lament & sigh in the name of all regenerated persons over the contrast between wish & doing, that the flesh, sin, still clings to him & is a hindrance at every step in the service of God.

266.
8, 1-4.

Chapter VIII.

8, 1-4. The Walking in the Spirit.

Vv. 1-4.

Ancient expositors & among the moderns one especially Hodge suppose that the Apostle now turns back to his principle theme, the doctrine of justification, & in 2, 1-4 they find the thought carried out that the Christians are justified before God without guilt, because the law of the Spirit, that is, the Gospel, has freed them from the curse of the Law, because Christ, God's Son, has atoned for the guilt of sin & has fulfilled the Law for them. But one need only attentively read thru the entire section, the first half of the 2. chapter, in order to recognize that Paul here further dwells on the same theme, which he had amplified in 1, 1 on, the sanctification of the Christians, which he now raises under the point of view of their conduct in the Spirit with the doctrine of justification he had come to an end at the close of the 1. chapter.

And so one cannot take the first statement of the new section, 2, 1, the well-known statement: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," in its context & treat it as a proof passage for the doctrine of justification. The Greek text reads: $\delta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \nu\upsilon\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\delta\epsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \gamma\omicron\upsilon\omega\sigma\iota$. That means, translated exactly: "to gift is also him condemnation with them who are in Christ," & so on. These expositors, who in the foregoing section, in the second half of the 1. chapter, find the condition of the new regenerated pictured, take for granted that the Spirit with these words begins to describe his Christian's presence or, generally speaking, the condition of the regenerated, for whom the union of life with Christ is characteristic. They stress the $\nu\upsilon\upsilon$, which they understand in the temporal sense. But Paul has already previously spoken completely in the recent times and in this interpretation the $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ is out of place. The status regeneratus is still the reverse of the status in regeneratum & does not follow out of the latter. Very well does it present itself from the correctly understood $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \nu\upsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ 2, 20$, wherein, as we have seen, the foregoing amplification is comprehended, that which the Apostle states first of all, that for those who are in Christ, that is, the believing Christians, in whose name Paul had spoken previously with the $\epsilon\gamma\omega$, there is no judgment of condemnation, & so on. Since the Christians with the flesh still serve the law of sin, out of the weakness of their corrupt flesh & blood still sin very much every day, therefore one can suppose, & the thought itself comes to them in that the sin is contrary to them that with their continuing sin they have laden wrath & punishment upon themselves. Now, however, the Apostle gives them the assurance that they need to have no judgment because of these sins of weakness of theirs and certainly not because with their real sense, with their renewed mind & with they serve the law of God have pleasure in the law of God, & on the other hand, hate & abhor the evil. Also before God the renewed self of the Christians appears as his real self, according to which his judgment directs itself upon him. God judges the Christian according to the new man, not according to the old man, & therefore does not account to him the evil that his flesh still

Spirit Himself, the Spirit of God, insofar as He determines the conduct of man. And the law of sin is itself, -
insofar as it determines the conduct of man. The law of sin at the same time means a law of
death, since the sin delivers over to death those who follow & serve it. The Spirit is more closely designated
as a Spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus. We combine εἰς χριστὸν ἵστασθαι with τῷ πνεύματι. For the Spirit here
comes into consideration not insofar as He mediates life, but insofar as He mediates this life in Christ.
The Spirit of God - thus every Christian confesses with Paul - has imparted to me that life which is in
Christ Jesus, so that I now am & live in Christ Jesus, & thereby has freed me from the law of sin & death,
to which I had been subjected by nature. Therefore it is no longer the law of sin but the law of the Spirit
which is the norm of my life. This act of freeing of the Spirit is identical with that act of God which de-
signates the beginning of our Christianity, of which the Apostle had spoken in 6, 2 ff., that in Baptism we
are dead with Christ, dead to sin, & have become partakers of the resurrection of Christ, of the new, spir-
itual, divine essence, in which Christ now stands & lives. That is especially the office & work of the
Spirit of God, that He, thru Word & Sacrament, applies the work & benefit of Christ to the individual. Now
the freedom, of which Paul speaks in this verse, agrees with the entirety of which he had spoken in ver-
sely, is known sufficiently above.

More difficult & more complicated than v. 2 is the following sentence, viz: *Τὸ ἐν σὺν νόμῳ, ἐν ᾧ ῥοῦθ' ἐν τῇ σαρκί, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἔκτοσθ' οὖν πέμπει ἐν ἀμαρτανίαις σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί.* *Τὸ δυνάτω τοῦ νόμου,*
the substantivized adjective with the following genitive, means nothing else than "das Unvermögen" or
"die Unmacht der Leichen" ("the impotence or the weakness of the Law") and is a typical construction
to the following principle clause together with its supplement, v. 4. Similar construction is found in
Heb. 9, 14: *καρδίας οὐ ἐπὶ τοῖς λογιμένοις, τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες ἀρχιερεῖς* etc. The corresponding German
manner of speech is somewhat: "was das Unvermögen der Leichen anlangt" (according to the sense that is there
as much as) "was dem Besten unmöglich war." Wherein the impotency of the Law proved itself, what was impos-
sible for the Law, one sees however, first from the following. First of all Paul adds a short confirmation to the
underlined oppositional modifier, *ἐν ᾧ ῥοῦθ' ἐν τῇ σαρκί*, "denn" each was and each das
"flesh" or "morgue des Leichen" ("in that it was weak through the flesh"), & with that stress that the impot-
ency or weakness of the Law within discussion has its foundation not in the Law itself, but in the sinful
flesh of the children of men, to whom it had been given. The subject of the principle clause is *ὁ θεός*, and the
underlined limitum, the predicate is *κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί*. Between the subject
& the predicate, however, there is inserted a parenthesis, *τὸν ἔκτοσθ' οὖν πέμπει... περὶ ἀμαρτίας*,
which the predicate makes understandable. Thus the framework of the sentence is this: "What concerns the
impotency of the Law — thus God, in that He sent His Son — judged the sin in the flesh. He would first of all
bring home to our mind the sense & content of the individual parts of the sentence.

God has sent His Son. The act of love of God is emphatically brought into prominence by the placing in front of the $\tau\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\ \upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, $\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, $\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, the relationship of the Son is designated as metaphysical, cf. 1, 3, $\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ etc. The personality of Christ is designated as pre-existent, cf. Heb. 4, 4. "Philippi. God had sent His Son, who had been begotten of His essence, who had come forth from His bosom, & God 1, into the world, $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, Heb. 4, 4, $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, John 10, 26. God sent His Son $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, "in der Selbstlichkeit" or more exactly "in der Selbstheit des ursprünglichen Seins" ("in the likeness of himself, flesh"), so that He appeared in an outward form of existence, which was similar to the sin-laden nature of man." Meyer. Here also $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ is to be taken as a concretum. "Christ appeared not $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, which is the Eternity conception, nor $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, which is the Doctate conception, but $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, which is the biblical-Bibline manner of comprehension. $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is here evidently the entire human nature, as in John 1, 14; Rom. 1, 3; 9, 5; 1 John 4, 2, according to body & soul. "Philippi. The Son of God has become $\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa$, flesh. That is, man. John 1, 14. He has been manifested $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$, in the flesh, in the human nature. 1 Tim. 3, 16. He was without sin, Heb. 4, 15, still His human nature & appearance resembled the sinful flesh of the children of men, insofar that it was also subject to the weaknesses & infirmities of the human nature, which are the result of sin, &

also to death. And $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, "Selbstverleihen" or "under himself" (cf. "in sin"). This general expression includes every relationship of Christ to humanity. Christ should live the human life, suffering & death, in order to expiate the sin of men, & He has also done it. Meyer remarks very correctly on $\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$: "He comprehends rather the entire relationship, in which the sending of Christ stood over against human sin, therefore His atonement as well as His breaking of its power, which latter is in this fact at its germinence with $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\omega\varsigma$ etc. as the expected factor."

The predicate of the sentence is $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\omega\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ & $\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$. Most of the expositors, very correctly, take $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\omega\varsigma$ not of "Beating" ("punishment", or "Verächtlichung" ("destruction"), but of "Verwählung" ("condemnation"), & certainly of an actual condemnation of sin, & thereby combine $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ with $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\omega\varsigma$. Most ancient expositors then understand this expression of the fact that Christ through His flesh that in, through His suffering & death in the flesh, has taken away the power of sin to accuse man, thus has atoned for the guilt of the sin. There essentially also Philippi & Hodge. Most modern expositors on the other hand, here, find predicated the removal of the power & sovereignty of sin, so that God has denied sin the power to hold man in its dominion, in that they take $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ either also to be a direct of Christ or indirect to the fact "I am not in its

Gewalt das Sündenweld sterben Christi (so z. B. Meyer), oder durch das Leiden, & sterben Christi (so z. B. Hodge, Weiss), die Sünde da, wozu sie ihr dominium über die Welt gehabt hatte, in's Leiden des Sündensünderwunders habe." The context doubtless leads to the thought of the "Machtbrechung", the breaking of the power of sin. This thought, however, finds its most adequate expression in the foregoing words, when we with Hofmann take $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ with $\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, for which also the position of the words is clear. The expression $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ corre-

words then to the foregoing $\sigma\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$ the flesh, Christ was supposed to be meant, then $\sigma\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ would not dare be lacking. Nothing grammatically opposes the combination $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\psi\chi\eta\varsigma$. In the New Testament Greek, as already remarked earlier, prepositional modifiers are often added to a substantive without an article. That generally happens in the case which Hofmann characterizes thus: "Where the preposition or modifier is of the kind that the concept, to which it is joined, will not be considered at all without it, it can in itself be immediately." The meaning accordingly is, that God has judged the sin which has its habitation in the flesh, in the corrupt nature of man & rules the same. And now one dare not dissipate the concept $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \sigma\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, "meritless," "judged." The power, which sin has over the natural man, can, as we have shown this with $\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$, 6, 7, be regarded also as a claim of right, which sin has made on man. Man is under its nature & fully, as it were, under the jurisdiction of sin. And now God has denied, has taken from sin the right to hold man in its dominion & to master his nature; He has freed man from the jurisdiction of sin. But we do not have to think here with Hofmann of the subjective deliverance from the power & right of sin, which God renders inoperative in us. For the Spirit, so that the foregoing statement would be identical with the preceding participial clause, make against that. No, the brother here speaks of that which God has done in Christ once for the benefit of all mankind. God has sent His Son in the form of sinful flesh, in order to atone for & expiate sin; in this manner, thru Christ's life, suffering & death, has what of all atoned for the guilt of sin, but then also — and thereon lies the emphasis which lies on the $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \sigma\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ — has paid for, invalidated the sin, which had firmly established itself in the flesh of man, in general had redeemed man from the power & dominion, from the right of sin.

With such condemnation of sin in the flesh, however, God had aimed at the point, $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon\ \pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\psi\chi\eta\varsigma$, "dare die Rechtsforderung des Geistes in uns erfüllt werden" ("that the rightness of the law might be fulfilled in us"). $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\varsigma$ means, thus also not in our message, "Rechtsfertigungswürde" (judgment of justification), but only either "Rechtsforderung" (demand of right), "Rechtsanfang" (legal maxims), or the right in the facts of the case, the right doing, the being right. In connection with $\tau\omega\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon$ it can have only the first meaning. That was then, God's will & intention, that with us it should come to a fulfillment of the Law. And this intention is also attained. The Law is fulfilled in us, "die wir nicht nach dem Fleische wandeln, sondern nach dem Geist" ("who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit"), $\epsilon\psi\chi\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. We Christians, walk not after the impulse & instinct of the flesh, but after the impulse & disposition of the Holy Spirit. And that where the Spirit urges us is nothing else than what is right & good before God, what God demands of all men in His Law. The necessary consequence for this, however, was the condemnation of the sin in the flesh. Christ, in that He has redeemed us from the power & dominion of sin, has helped us, so that we now fulfill God's Law; we live not according to the flesh, but according

to the Spirit. What Christ, who is in Christ has done, that the Spirit of God has attributed to us. The Spirit is Christ, the Spirit of life, which is in Christ & us. As when we, when we became Christians, actually from the bondage of sin, from the Law, & from the dominion of sin & death through baptism into the name of Christ, & now He dwells in us & teaches us to do according to God's pleasure & leads us on a more suitable way.

Evidently now that which we read here in v. 4, v. 10 to Sinners & to Sinners & to Sinners, etc., is the correlate to v. 8 & 9 & 10 to Sinners, v. 3a, and points to the known law. The latter expression is meant. The weakness, the incapacity of the Law does not consist in the fact that the same cannot redeem us from sin, - who should then expect that, from the Law? - but in the fact that it does not help us with its own, fulfilled, merit. The Law does not enable man to decide to walk according to the Law, because it would be hindered by the sinful flesh of man, from reaching his will. And as God has thereby made that possible for us, which was impossible for the Law, that He thus He has condemned the sinners, the flesh.

For we recognize how the v. 3, and the v. 10, is meant. The present status quo, that we Christians walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit, where is the sending of Christ? His redemption has made us capable in proof of the act of deliverance of the Spirit, with which our condition of being Christians had begun. Proof for the fact that the Spirit has actually freed us: now the Law of sin & death, and this simple, act, that we are freed from the Spirit of life in Christ from the Law of sin & now walk according to the Spirit & fulfill the Law, is the foundation & cause why there is no longer any judgment of condemnation for us. This latter statement, v. 1, had already been introduced previously, in that it had followed from 7:25. & now this confirmation is then expanded & completed in the statement in v. 1-4. That we serve the Law of God with our mind, with our real self, is modified by the fact that we, being freed from the Law of sin, fulfill the Law of God and walk according to the Spirit. strikingly Luther gives the connection of the two verses, 7, & 4, in the already mentioned marginal notes: "Luther in really still regain the flesh, still it does not condemn, because the Spirit of God is righteous & sinners against it. Where it is not, there the Law is weakened & suppressed by the flesh, so that it is impossible that the Law should help man, except to sin & death. Therefore God sent His Son & laid upon Him our sins, & thus helped us to fulfill the Law through the Spirit."

The modern exegetes cannot find themselves completely in the fact that here in the 7. chapter it means self, the same moral condition should be described as in the second half of the 7. chapter. And even the closing part of the passage, 7, 1-4, the purpose clause in v. 4, appears to contradict that which the apostle had previously written concerning his commitment under the Law of sin. But it only appears so. In reality both 7, 14, 23, 25 & as well as also 7, 4 agrees with the present condition of the Christians, with the experience of the regenerated. Luther writes: Ceterum aliud est servire carnis legi peccati, cum legi tibi in mente scribitur quod de reatu, quia non propter spirituales sunt, aliter ut cap. VII v. ult. aliud ambulare non secundum carnem sed secundum carnem, quod in reatu legem non habet, nec cum gratia dei aut fide iustificante consistit potest. Quia

272.
8, 5-11.

it is in its own will, but in its own will, quae caro dictat et reguntis carnalis; nam et ambrosius
studium et frequentationem exercit voluntarium et meliorum in fort. Paul. 1. Non caro dictatur
quidem adversus spiritum, non autem ei predominatur, hic vero predominatur caro. Per hunc ergo
etiam imbecillitatem carnis adhuc sentiant, non tamen secundum carnem ambulant, aut carnalibus
desideriis indulgent. The regenerated still in daily, out of the weakness of their corrupted, flesh & blood, &
thereby still come the law of sin, even the contrary to their will, contrary to their better wishing, because the flesh
clings to them their whole life long. But the flesh does not govern their life, their conduct. Caro non erit do-
minans. They walk in a prevalent manner, not after the flesh but after the spirit. The spirit of God has the
predominance in them & determines their actions, & so their conduct agrees with the law of God, even the
their fulfilment of the law is still imperfect & their actions remain far behind their willing. And because
the spirit has the power among them, therefore God does not reckon the weakness of their flesh to them,
according as the Son of God through his life, suffering & death in the flesh has atoned for all his sins & trans-
gressions of men. Moreover, that which the apostle remarks in 3, 1-4 concerning the non-condemnation
of the sins of weakness of the Christians, is only an additional remark within the extensive, universal de-
scription of Christian sanctification, which had begun in 2, 1. And the statement in 3, 4, in which the section
2, 1-4 comes to an end, has, even though it is not a confirmation of 2, 1, still at the same
time an evident significance, in that the thought expressed herein is involved further in the following. The
expressions, that we Christians fulfil the law & walk not after the flesh but after the spirit, give the character
to the entire section, 2, 1-12, in which the concept *πνεῦμα* stands out everywhere. This is, as already re-
marked earlier, the manner of Paul, that he gives expression to a principle thought, which he then carries
out, often first in a subordinate sentence, perhaps in a statement of confirmation.

8, 5-11.

It appears that in this section the contrast between the flesh & spirit is further illustrated. And certainly
in this manner, that the men who are carnal are contrasted to those who are spiritual. The former are called in
v. 5. οἱ κατὰ σὰρκά ὄντες, that is, those who are fashioned according to the flesh, who have their moral qualities &
nature from the flesh; the latter, οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα αἰσθητες, that is, those who are fashioned according to the
spirit, who are regenerated by the spirit & are therefore spirit. John 3, 3. The fleshly fashioned mind, but which
is of the flesh, τὸ κατὰ σὰρκά φρονεῖν. φρονεῖν includes both, thinking & willing. τὸ κατὰ
σὰρκά are "the things" or "intercession" of the flesh, more exactly designated τὰ ἐγγὺς τῶν σαρκῶν, the works of
flesh, as they are enumerated, for example, in Gal. 5, 19. Weiss. The thinking & endeavours of the carnal minded
lead to the satisfactions of the lusts & desires of the flesh. Gal. 5, 17. The spiritually minded, on the other hand,
(mind that which is of the spirit, τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα φρονεῖν, the things, works, fruits of the spirit, as they are specified,

for example in Gal. 5, 22. Self-evidently then, the carnally minded walk according to the flesh, the spiritually minded according to the spirit. Out of the fashions & nature there grows itself the disposition, & the disposition manifests itself in works & conduct. "Denn die Bestimmung des Fleisches ist der Tod, die Bestimmung aber des Geistes Leben und Heil" ("For to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life & peace"). Here the "denn", "for", γὰρ, is to be taken explicatively. The mood of the flesh, like that of the spirit, is still more closely characterized. To πορεύεσθαι does not mean the thing striven for, but according to Strümm and Kieckhefer, as also in the classics, the striving, the disposition, studium, "Tacklen und Tacklen", "the aims & endeavors." The aims & endeavors of the flesh stand, in the last analysis, even if in an unconscious manner, in death, insofar as the fleshly joys & pleasures finally bring death to man. Gal. 6, 21. The thought & aims of the spirit on the other hand, stand on life & salvation. "Leben", "life", ζωή, is here, in contrast to death, the eternal life, & to the corresponding εἰργάζεσθαι the completed salvation, as in 2, 10. Gal. 5, 22. Life and salvation do not have their real cause in the spiritual mind & striving, although the spiritual life comes to an end in eternal life. The spiritual life, which, grows out of the saving faith or justification is not the causa regnandi, but really the res regni. Thus far flesh & spirit are differentiated from one another, like death & life.

"Denn die Bestimmung des Fleisches ist Feindschaft wider Gott." ("Because the carnal mind is enmity against God"). V. 8. That is the real mind of the flesh, the root of the carnal disposition, enmity against God. The carnal-minded men contrive the works of the flesh, even insofar & on that account because the same are evil, ungodly, contrary to God. This God-hating mind shows itself in the fact that the flesh, for γὰρ, the principle subject of the discussion, & not τὸ πορεύεσθαι is subject to εἰς τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, does not subject itself to the Law of God. If the Law of God enters into the natural man, & prohibits & criticizes the fleshly desires, then the flesh sets itself against that & contradicts & strives against God & the will of God with all its powers. "Denn es vermag es auch nicht" ("neither indeed can it"). The form & nature of the flesh brings with itself that it cannot be subject to the Law of God. "Es aber im Fleisch sind, können Gott nicht gefallen" ("So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God"). 3. εἰς ἅπαντας ὅντες, those whose entire being is resolved in the flesh, who live & move in the flesh as their element & are thereby hostile to God & resist the Law of God, cannot possibly please God, but much rather draw God's displeasure, God's enmity, & wrath & thus also death down upon themselves. Thus with this sentence structure in v. 8 is proven the statement in v. 6 a, that the disposition of the flesh is death.

) The statement in Rom. 8, 7: τὸ πορεύεσθαι τῆς σαρκὸς ἐστὶν ἐχθρὰ εἰς θεόν, "Fleischlich sein ist eine Feindschaft wider Gott" ("The carnal mind is enmity against God"), has become in the Lutheran Church a salient dictum probans for the doctrine of the complete & basic corruption of man. Luther remarks on this point: "Fleischlich sein" is that one seeks nothing about God, or considers nothing about Him & understands nothing thereof, God's contempt, unbelief, disobedience, evil lusts and

striving against God's Commandment. To such Paul gives the title & name, that 'the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.' That is the stem & root of all other sins & evils of the distressing original sin of Adam in Paradise, that if this had not been, then there would never be any thievery, murder, adultery, etc. Now the world really sees such outwardly evil things, yea, wonders & complains about them that the people are so evil, but it does not know how it happens. They really see the rivulet, now & burst forth in all sorts of leaves & fruits of the evil tree; but whence the spring comes forth & where the root hides they know not. "G. Eberle, Luthers Epistle against the Augung, pp. 122, 123. The Formula of Concord confesses in the 2. Article on the basis of Rom. 8, 7, 8, that the unregenerated will of man is not only turned away from God, but also has become an enemy of God, so that it has only lust & will to evil & to that which is contrary to God." Mueller, Symb. B. p. 523-24. The typology proves from Rom. 8, 7, 8 and similar passages, that man's nature cannot love God, that the apparently good works of natural man are worthless before God. "These testimonies are so manifest that, to use the words of Augustine which he employed in this case, they do not need an acute understanding, but only an attentive hearer. If the carnal mind is enmity against God, the flesh certainly does not love God; if it cannot be subject to the Law of God, it cannot love God. If the carnal mind is enmity against God, the flesh loves, even when we do external civil works. If it cannot be subject to the Law of God, it certainly sins, even when, according to human judgment, it possesses deeds that are excellent & worthy of praise." (Trig. p. 127). And concerning the conversion of the sinner it presents itself from Rom. 8, 9, as the Formula of Concord writes: "that the free will from its own natural powers, not only cannot work or concur in working anything for its own conversion, righteousness, & salvation, nor; o' love (obey), believe, or assent to the Holy Spirit, who through the Gospel offers him grace & salvation, but from its innate, wicked, rebellious nature it resists God & His will hostilely, unless it be enlightened & controlled by God's Spirit." (Trig. p. 832-83). Yea, all synergism, like the modern theory that the natural, unconverted man possesses the ability to decide, for God & Christ by virtue of the so-called arbitrium liberatum, or with the help of the so-called preliminary grace to discontinue the so-called wonton resistance, is punished as lies by the word of Scripture, Rom. 8, 7: "The carnal mind is enmity against God." For such an ability would presuppose a natural disposition & the use of this ability in bonum partem would presuppose a certain friendliness over against God in unconverted man. No, the natural man resists God, & certainly to his viribus, wherever God always declares Himself to him, resists both the Law of God & the Gospel of God, & can do nothing else; his nature permits nothing else. Only God by His creative power & grace, can change the perverted direction of the will, which is closely joined together with the nature of man. And that God does when He converts the sinful man. There out of unwilling, resisting ones He makes willing ones out of enemies friends. And as soon as the resister has yielded in something, as soon as man leans toward God & His Gospel only with the slightest longing of his heart, then he is converted. But as far as the regenerated still has the flesh in himself, he also still finds in

righteousness. With Paucker, Krüger, Meyer, Philipp, Hofmann, Luthardt, Hodt & most of the ancients we understand under $\sigma\kappa\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$, which is simply contrasted to sin, the righteousness simply, the right-
 $\sigma\kappa\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau'\epsilon\gamma\gamma\eta\varsigma$, the perfect righteousness, which is for all times present in Christ. The righteousness of life is a cause of life: that is an unending unscriptural thought. That life, the salvation from righteou-
 ness, which follows justification, — that the Gospel had demonstrated in detail in Rom. 5. The Christians have become partakers of eternal life thru the faith of the righteousness which avails before God, & with that already according to the soul & according to the beginnings are partakers of eternal life. In the on-
 going context, where the Apostle describes eternal life as a goal, end & issue of spiritual life, it was com-
 pletely pointed out, once again to point to it in short, that eternal life is certainly originally based
 simply & alone in the objective righteousness in the righteousness of Christ, so that no one might base the certai-
 nty of his salvation on his imperfect sanctifications.

It reads further in v. 11: "Wenn aber der Geist dessen, der Jesus von den Todten auferweckt hat, in euch wohnt, so wird der, welcher Christus von den Todten auferweckt hat, auch eure sterblichen Leiber lebendig machen, weil er in euch wohnt." But if the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. With the $\sigma\iota\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota$ leads over from that which he had said concerning the spirit of the Christians to a statement which refers to their body. The principle phrase of this verse asserts that God shall also quicken our mortal bodies, $\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$, which would say that at one time He will take the same from death and transfer them into life, the true life, the spiritual, divine life, into the life of glorification. Ep. 1 Cor. 15, 23. 25ff. where the $\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ is more closely modified by the fact that we shall receive a $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ — $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$. The God who shall quicken our mortal bodies is here designated as the One who has raised up Christ from the dead, $\delta\ \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\ \rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$. But intentionally was the name $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ here, while he shortly before had written $\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\rho$. $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ is the Mediator of salvation. Christ has died for our benefit & has risen for our benefit. He is the firstfruits of them that sleep, 1 Cor. 15, 20. He, in that He Himself has risen & entered into the life of glorification, has prepared the resurrection & the life, the life of glorification for us. We should become partakers of His resurrection, of His glory. Our perishable bodies should become similar to His glorified body. Phil. 3, 21. Our resurrection & glorification have their foundations in the resurrection of Christ from the dead. This fact of the future, however, is deduced in our verse from the fact expressed in the evocative, $\epsilon\gamma\ \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ etc., from the fact that the Spirit of Him, who has raised Jesus from the dead, dwells in us. These facts of the past & the present guarantee that fact of the future. The Spirit of Him who has raised up Jesus, the Spirit of God, who quickens the dead, the Spirit of life now already dwells in us, in our hearts, & has inwardly according to the Spirit, according to the soul, already made us partakers of His & the incorruptible essence. Our spirit is already life, as we

have read in v. 10. And therefore God, who has given the spirit into our hearts, who with his work of the Spirit, v. 17, s. 1,

has already made the beginning, shall certainly and completely finish the work of this alone time, and quicken our mortal bodies, lead them over into the life in which the glorified Christ, our Savior & Redeemer, now already stands. The beginning guarantees the end. Cf. Eph. 1, 4, where the Spirit of God, who dwells in the Christians, is called the "firstfruits", "earnest", ἐγγύς, of our inheritance, of our future redemption. Both things are highly comforting for us Christians, who according to the body still lie & groan under the power of death, first, that we know that God has raised Christ, from the dead & that in the resurrection of Christ our Savior, the first of its future, our resurrection, is based, has already been established & given, and, secondly, that God lives Christ, that the exalted, glorified Christ has sent & given the Holy Spirit, in whom we gain a security, an earnest of our future resurrection. The closing part of the verse reads differently in the ancient versions. NABG offers the reading: οὗτος ὁ πνεῦμα ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου. On the other hand, DEFL, as also the ancient church fathers & most old translations, have the accusative: οὗτος ὁ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου. With right most modern expositors adopt the latter reading, & rightly, from inner grounds. The thought that οὗτος ὁ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου, leads the Spirit quickens the dead, without biblical analogy. On the other hand, the οὗτος ὁ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου, the comprehension, "um des willen, dass Jesus Christ in euch wohnt" ("because he dwells in you"), by his Spirit that dwells in you."

(NABG), corresponds to the parallel, Εἰς ὅτι ὁ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἡμῖν, and brings its content once more very emphatically to acceptance.

The spiritual life of the Christians, the Spirit of God & of Christ who dwells in the Christians, animates life, like eternal, & likewise also at the glorification of our mortal bodies. That is the summary of v. 9-11. And as this passage, v. 9-11, evidently serves as a proof for v. 12: ὅτι ὁ πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἡμῖν, so the same as by the preceding passage, v. 7, 8. The first part of the verse had been proven. The double statement in v. 10 accordingly governs the entire section, v. 7-11. And the last, which is here brought into prominence & placed into the light, that the mind of the flesh is dead, the mind of the spirit, on the other hand, is life and salvation, is for the Christians a motive, so that they walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit. This is the meaning of γὰρ, v. 5.

V. 12-17.

After the Apostle had shown how it actually stands with the Christians he permits an admonition to follow, the same as he had added the admonition in 3, 12-14 to the description of the Christian condition, 3, 1-11. The words οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν, v. 12, do not contain an admonition formally, but according to the sense & content. Nihil autem hoc conclusio nisi exhortationis, quemadmodum semper a doctrina exhortationem solit deducere. Calvin. We Christians are not debtors to the flesh. "The natural man presumes that he is obligated to grant satisfaction to his flesh." Hofmann. And that means also the Christian,

insofar as the flesh still clings to him. Therefore, however, the Christians should know that they owe no consideration to the flesh, that they have no obligation over against the flesh. The indicative clause $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha\ \gamma\tau\upsilon$ does not depend directly on $\sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, as, for example, Turner & Fitzke over-interpret it, according to the construction $\sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota$, since $\sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ certainly has its object in the preceding dative $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota$, but is an independent subordinate sentence with "telicheis" meaning: "The condition of guilt over against the flesh, if such a thing existed, would aim at the point & bring with itself that we live according to the flesh, that we give way to the flesh in all points. Even against that Paul would have warned the Christians. This warning & admonition, to whose following he would induce his readers as much the more willingly with the address 'Brethren', he concludes by means of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ out of the preceding section, v. 1-11, and certainly from the principle thought, which had been brought forth very strongly at the close, v. 11, that the Christians thru the Spirit are freed from the law of sin & of the flesh, that the Spirit of God dwells in them. And now he points again, as already previously in v. 5-11, to the wretched result of a walking & a life according to the flesh, in order to deter the Christians from a hasty licence & life: "Wenn wir nicht dem Geiste leben, werdet ihr sterben müssen" ("for if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die", $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\theta\eta\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, v. 13a. In this case that is the lot designated for you, from which you shall not escape. Under the dying here, as under $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, 2: 2; 3: 2, the crisis is an unconscious one with already manifestly pronounced malice of the word. The Christians should not think that it would not hurt them as much, just because they are & are called Christians, if they let the flesh do as it pleases. No, they have, when they fall back into the service of the flesh, nothing else to expect than all servitudes of the flesh, namely, death & condemnation. The position of the $\sigma\phi$ is before $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota$, not before $\sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, already has pointed to the fact that the opposite at the same time has the reverse in mind, the life according to the Spirit. And this he brings out expressly in v. 13 b: "Wenn ihr aber nicht dem Geiste die Leiden des Fleisches tötet, so werdet ihr leben" ("but if ye thru the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live"). The life of the Spirit shows itself first of all & above all in the mortification of the flesh. By the power of the Spirit of God, who dwells in them, the Christians come & should mortify the flesh. Still Paul writes not $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, but $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. The latter is the predominantly attested reading. And $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$ designates here as little as elsewhere body & soul, & is also not synonymous with $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota$, flesh. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$ is simply the body with its members, and $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ are the actions, the works of the body. The body, however, here comes into consideration, as in 6: 12, as an organ of sin & of the flesh, which seeks to carry out their will thru the members of the body. And now, if the flesh would activate body & members, then the Christians - that is the meaning, - by the power of the Spirit should immediately step in & stop the actions of the body in the bad, before they become fulfilled works, 2p. 12. Thence they then put to death & crucify the flesh with its works & desires, Gal. 5: 24. And if they do that, then they shall live, shall receive life in the full sense of the word, the real, eternal life. To live after the flesh means a death.

Mortification of the flesh, on the other hand, is the way of life. Certainly eternal life is & remains under all circumstances a free, undeserved gift of God which comes to us only because of Christ. If we nevertheless live & walk according to the flesh, if we discontinue to mortify the flesh, then we throw away & lose the gift.

It is easy to recognize how the second part of the section, introduced with γὰρ, the passage v. 14-17, joins itself to the first part. The connection of thought is simple & plain. The statement, to which the remainder resp. the admiration, v. 12, 13, had come: "If ye throw the Spirit so mortifying the deeds of the body, ye shall live," is thereby established, that those whom the Spirit of God moves are children of God; but children are heirs, thus children of God are heirs of eternal life or of the future glory.

The argumentation begins in v. 14 with the words: "ὅσοι ᾠδοῦνται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν." "Es sind so viele von Geist Gottes getrieben worden, als sind solche Kinder." ("For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God"). The Epistle had remarked in v. 9, that whoever does not have the Spirit of Christ is none of his. Only those who have the Spirit of Christ are in truth those who belong to Christ, Christians. The Holy Spirit, who dwells in the hearts of the Christians, however, is never idle, but always busy & active. He urges, leads & rules the Christians. The mortification of the flesh of which v. 13 had spoken, is a spiritual work of the Spirit; where this is found, there the Spirit has. This work is principally. The Spirit of

God moves & urges the Christians, draws & holds them away from the evil, from the works of the flesh, & leads them into all good works. The matter is the same, whether it says that the Christians mortify the flesh, resp. do good by the power of the Spirit, or, that the Spirit leads them, whether in the description of the spiritual life the Spirit of God or the Christians is introduced as the subject. The Holy Spirit works all good in the Christians, but this action & urging of the Holy Spirit is, as our Conscience emphasizes, not a coercion, not a constraint. The Spirit of God operates here thru the renewed self, thru the renewed will of the regenerated. And so one can ascribe the works of the Spirit also to the Christian, to the renewed self of the Christian. The Spirit of God is & remains the real subiectum movens et agens, and moved, urged, lifted up, borne by the Spirit of God the Christians fight & overcome sin & flesh & do & fulfill with desire & joy the which is pleasing to God. And now it says that as many as are led by the Spirit of God, those & only those, οὗτοι, are God's children. Here for the first time in our Letter the Epistle designates the Christians as sons, as children of God. He uses the expression υἱοὶ θεοῦ evidently in the same sense as the expressions υἱοὶ θεοῦ in v. 14, thus as a designation of our position, of our relationship to God. We Christians are & appear before God as children, & God is our Father & shows & gives Himself to us as a Father. We have become justified before

God thru faith in Christ, so that God has a heart-felt pleasure toward us. That fact Paul had presented in detail in the first part of the Letter. And that one can also express thus, that we have become children of God thru faith in Christ Jesus. Rom 8, 26. In our passage, however, the Epistle calls special attention to the fact, that those whom the Spirit of God leads are children of God. That the Spirit leads them does not first make them into children, but proves them as children of God. Of those who are led by the Spirit of God it

280.
8, 12-17.

certainly applies that they are children of God

Wenn ihr habt nicht einen Geist der Knechtschaft empfangen wider zur Furcht, sondern
ihr habt einen Geist der Kinderheit empfangen, durch welchen wir rufen: Abba, Vater. Es heißt, der
Geist, gibt Zeugnis unserm Geist, dass wir Gottes Kinder sind. "For ye have not received the spirit of bond-
age again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself
beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God": 1 v. 15, 16. A similar expression of Paul
is found in Gal. 4, 6: "Dass ihr aber Kinder seid," which would say, as a proof thereof, that you are children;
"that God gesandt den Geist seines Sohnes in eure Herzen, der da ruft: Abba, Vater!" "Because ye are
sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father". Here with the
receiving of the Spirit the Epistle proves the adoption of God. Now, passage he stresses that as many as are
led by the Spirit of God are certainly children of God. They are that; for the Spirit who leads removes them as
a Spirit of adoption. This argumentation precludes that the πνεῦμα of whom the discussion is in 1 v. 15, is
the same πνεῦμα as the one mentioned in 1 v. 14 and 1 v. 6, namely the Spirit of God, as almost expositors
take it, and not, as, for example, Krotn, de Wette & Philippi would, as a subjective human effect,
"Geistesstimmung". To this latter interpretation one is reasonably forced, certainly, if one finds as doubt-
ful πνεῦμα distinguished in 1 v. 15. With that can be meant only the difference between "Knechtschem
Geist" (servile spirit) and "Kindlichem Geist" (childlike spirit). But the Epistle does not write πνεῦμα
ἐν δούλο. πνεῦμα δουλεύει, thus he says nothing of a spirit of bondage, which the readers had previously
received, but he classifies the πνεῦμα before ἐν δούλο. He speaks throughout this section of the one Spirit, which his
readers had received when they became Christians, the Spirit of God, & denies that of all in 1 v. 15, that this
Spirit is a spirit of bondage. If it were that, then the Christians must certainly fear, be afraid & tremble
before God, as previously, when they were in servitude under the Law. But no, the Spirit of God who is in the
Christians, is not a spirit of bondage, but a Spirit of adoption. δουλεύει designates the condition of a
servant, and υἱοθεσία means first of all adoption & then the relationship of a child established through
adoption, the condition of a child. As also Rom. 9, 4; Eph. 1, 5. The genuine δουλεύει and υἱοθεσία are
genitives of the characterizing attribute. And now why the Spirit, whom the Christians have received, is called
after the adoption, is shown by the relative clause: ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ υἱοθετοῦντες, & κατὰ τὴν. We Christians cry:
Abba, Father. As often as we draw near to God & pray to Him, we speak comfortingly with all confidence:
Abba, beloved Father. The Aramaic name of God, Abba, has passed over into the N. H. Greek language of
prayer, & the ardor of the feeling of adoption, "as Meyer correctly remarks, urged the Hellenistic
Christians to repeat the name of the Father in their mother tongue. But that we thus place ourselves over
against God & pray, as to our beloved Father, we do (ἐν τῷ) by the power of the Spirit of God. The Spirit
whom we have received invites & leads us to prayer, & even to such childlike, confident praying. And how
does He do that, what sort of effect of the Spirit brings forth in us the cry of Abba, is stated by the following

clause, which is therefore added "anydictals," because it modifies the ἐν ᾧ in ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς ἀποδοσόμεθα.

ἡμεῖς καὶ ὁ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἡμεῶν ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ. "We will, our best gift Zeugnis our own Geist, dass wir Gottes Kinder sind" ("The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God"). v. 16. With Luther we take ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἡμεῶν as "Zeugnis", not as "Mitzeugnis." The ὅτι serves also otherwise often in composition only for the strengthening of the concept. In Rom. 9, 1 only the "Zeugnis des Geistes" is in place, not the "Mitzeugnis." Our spirit cannot properly be called "Zeug" (witness), at whose side then stands the witness of the Spirit of God. Our spirit, out of whose inner parts the cry of Father rings forth, is not a witness which makes certain the adoption, but is made sure by the adoption in that it is received from another, a greater one. Still the Spirit of God alone who renders authentic, demonstrative testimony, who gives us certainty, divine certainty of the fact that we are the children of God. He is the Spirit of the Son of God who has merited the adoption for us. Gal. 4, 6. The testimony of the Spirit of God is entirely independent of our own deliberations & feelings; we then perceive this witness in our spirit if we would once enter into the fatherly disposition of God. It hardly still needs the remark, that this witness of the Spirit, as the receiving of the Spirit himself & all effects of the Spirit, is mediated by "the hearing of faith." Gal. 3, 2. The preaching of faith, the Gospel of Christ testifies to us repeatedly and emphatically, in manifold ways, that we are beloved children of God, that God's father heart stands open to us always. And the Spirit of God makes this Word alive in our hearts, through this Word itself, personally speaks to our hearts & persuades & convinces us that we are really & truly children, & not servants, children of God. And even in this manner, through such testimony He entices & calls forth out of our hearts the cry of Abba. Therefore one can already of the Spirit, as it reads in Gal. 4, 6, that He cries, Abba, Father. The Spirit of God is thus a Spirit not of bondage but of adoption. And when the Word the Spirit of God makes Himself alive and active upon & in us, as in the mortification of the works of the flesh, then that is a certain proof for the fact that we are the children of God.

But then the Spirit of v. 1, 3 also applies: "und wir also Kinder, so sind wir auch Erben, nämlich Gottes Erben, Mit Erben aber Christus, so sind andere mit Erben, auf dass wir auch mit ihm erben werden." "And if children, then heirs: heirs of God, & joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together". v. 17. Sp. Gal. 4, 7: "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; & if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." According to divine & human laws children are heirs, they have a claim on the property of their fathers & shall receive the same in their time. Children of God are heirs of God:

They have a claim on the good which God has intended for His children, & they are joint heirs with Christ; they shall receive the good which Christ, the first-born Brother, had taken already in the beginning. And this good is the eternal life, v. 13, or the heavenly glory (ὁ υἱος ἑσθλὸς βίωσις), into which Christ has already entered through suffering & death. They shall certainly then be partakers of the glory of Christ only when they previously suffer with Christ, willingly & patiently take upon themselves all the offense which befalls

them for Christ's sake. *Quia necesse non conditio sunt, nec in vita, nec morte, quem in eis in hominibus ad aeternam hereditatem admittendis constituit, si non erat. Quia enim unicus constitutus erat visus et acceptus. labor.* This last thought leads over to the following sections. Therefore the Epistle in the foregoing sections employs the comforting articles of the adoption of God & the inheritance of eternal life to excite the Christians to mortify the flesh & to live after the Spirit.

We can comprehend the rich content of the entire section, 3, 1-17, in the following statement:

The Epistle reminds the Christians that the Spirit of God dwells in them & that they are therefore obligated to live after the Spirit, who guarantees to them the adoption & the heavenly inheritance, & warns them earnestly against walking according to the flesh, so that they do not die & be condemned.

8, 18-39. Comfort in suffering.

V. 18-22.

The Epistle had closed the previous section with the words: "If we be that we suffer with him, he also may be also glorified together." Patient suffering is also a part of sanctification, of the spiritual life. One new from v. 18 on the Epistle brings for encouragement, which should make the Christians determine to take the cross of Christ upon themselves willingly. Comfort in the cross is the principle content of the second half of the 2. chapter. Paul therefore Paul then gives the Christians to convince that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy (to be compared with) the future glory. He calls the sufferings which the Christians experience for the sake of Christ *τὰ παρὸν καὶ οὐκ ὄντα*. These belong to the present time, the time of this world & thus cease, when the time of the world is at an end. It reads nevertheless not *τὸν αἰῶνα*, *τοῦτον*, but *τὸν αἰῶνα*. The present time, the time of suffering is a quickly passing, short period of time, a period that is already a comfort for the suffering Christians. Paul also comforted the cross-bearers by the fact that "ye are in a wilderness, as a man in a wilderness" (1 Pet. 1, 3). The real statement in our passage, however, points to the fact that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy of comparison with the coming glory. *οὐκ ὀλίγον τι πόνος ὅτις ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ὁ πόνος, ἀλλὰ ὁ μέγας ὁ δόξα ἡ ἐρχομένη*. If 100 is *quod habemus* *habuit*. When one lays the sufferings of this time into the one balance scale, the future glory into the other, then the former springs up to the heights. The sufferings of the present time are of no great importance, they are of no consequence in comparison to the glory which shall be revealed in us. For that is an eternal boundless, immeasurably great glory. This glory is now already present in Christ, & on that day he shall return in all this glory, & this glory, which is now hidden, shall be revealed, however, on that day; it is designated for us, *εἰς ἡμᾶς*, we should & shall be partakers of the same, even be glorified with Christ. This sentence, in which he compares the present suffering with the future glory, the Epistle introduces with the words: *Νοῦν ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς, ὅτι...* In his part he had done more & suffered more than all the Epistles, but when in his severe suffering he had

been richly comforted & had them had to deep look into their own misdeeds. 11 Cor. 1, 11, 12. Thus he knew from experience what the cross of Christ is, & could therefore give such judgment & liberally summon his readers to decide whether this valuation of the Christian's suffering is not correct. A parallel to Rom. 5, 18 is 11 Cor. 4, 12: τὸ γὰρ παρὰ τὴν ἐλαφρότητα τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον. ἄρα, ὁ ὅς τις παρὰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡμῶν.

The γὰρ in v. 18, by means of which the following statement is joined to v. 17, we refer to the real expressions contained in the predicate of the 12. verse & not to some modifiers of the same & thus in the following sentence, find not the certainty (thus, for example, to Wells, Phil. 2, 10; 11 Cor. 1, 11), still less the intensity (thus, for example, Phil. 2, 10) but with most of the emphasis the greatness of the glory established, which shall be revealed to us. That is the thing that has occurred & which that express the content of the following verses. The Lucille speaks in the name of the κτίσις and understands under that almost of the ancient & modern operations have correctly acknowledged, the irrational creatures, the animate & inanimate, that which we generally call nature. He places the κτίσις, the creature, along side the children of God, who forms a part of humanity; & thus considers the creature, which makes up the surroundings of man, of whom we read in the first article: "I believe that God has made me & all creatures." And of the creature he now says that they wait for the manifestation of the children of God, which means, they wait for this, that the children of God shall be revealed in that which they are; that takes place, when the glory shall be revealed & the children of God shall be united with the same. The εἰς in ἀποδεχόμενοι "hence, as in ἀποδεχόμενοι, ἀποδοῦναι, ἀποδοῦναι, the sense that one is quite beside oneself, 'gang auf geist in etwas'." (Hofmann), & does not correspond to the German "abwarten" (waiting for), so that one waits until the expectation is fulfilled. For in v. 22 Paul gives the command, οὐτε ἵνα εἴη, which falls together with the waiting, the modifier ὅτι τοῦ νῦν, and not somewhat ὅτι τοῦ τότε. Thus he speaks here of that which is the case from the beginning even to the present time, & reflects back on the fact that this goes on even to the end. In this poetic passage the apostle personifies the creature, in that he ascribes to it a waiting, & then, in order to strengthen his statement, he still further personifies this waiting, in that he expresses himself thus: ἢ ὡς παρὰδοκίαν τῆς κτίσεως ... ἀποδεχόμενοι. Παρὰδοκίαν means: with outstretched nose, thus to look into the distance with strains & longing. The ἀπο here has the same sense as ἀποδεχόμενοι. The irrational creature thus looks out with strains & expectations for the revelation of the children of God, like an event desired for itself. What the final revelation of the children of God has to signify for the creature comes out in the following.

) This present status quo, the hoping & waiting of the creature, has its foundation in a favor of the Lord, to which the apostle points in v. 20: τῇ γὰρ χάριτι ὅτι τῇ κτίσις ἐπεταί, ὅτι ἐκούσας, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. The creature has been subjected to the κατεταγμένη, namely, transitoriness. Everything earthly vanishes, blossoms for a short time & fades: withers & becomes dust. "Everywhere we have pictures of death & decay before our eyes; the plague of our infirmities, the raging of the elements,

the destructive power of the wild animals, the laws themselves which govern the plant life, everything gives nature a gloomy appearance." Hence that has not been thus from the first beginning. The creature, having come forth from God's creative hand, bore in themselves the force, the power & the law of life. But then an event soon took place, which has changed the original conditions of things. Since that time the creatures have succumbed to vanity. Or much rather, they are subject to the same, ὡς ἡμεῖς, as subjected with power, οὐκ ἐκ οὐδ' αὐτοῦ, against their will, in that their own nature resists: "uns deswillen, deswillen wider." "by reason of him who hath subjected the same", because another one has not desired & decided. He who gave the creature over to perishableness is God, the Lord of the creature, Paul has in mind the judgment of God in Gen. 3, 17, where God spoke to Adam: "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, & hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, I have said, thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." The man had sinned with knowledge & will, wanted the evil which God had expressly forbidden, & thereby wanted his death & condemnation. And now because of man, God also gave the creature over to the curse, death & condemnation. The emphasis, however, in the statement in v. 20 lies on the final modifiers ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, "auf Hoffnung" ("in hope"), which one most fittingly combines with the medium limitum, ὡς ἡμεῖς. In that God placed the curse of sin also upon the creature, permitted the innocent creatures to suffer with the guilty man; He had at the same time had in sight as future change of this disparity, so that the suffering creatures could hope for a change & improvement of their condition.

What the creature has to expect is further amplified in v. 21: ὅτι καὶ οὗτοι ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερώσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ. We do not take this sentence, which is introduced with ὅτι, as an object clause to ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, in the sense "in hope that," etc., as, for example, Meyer would do, for ἐπ' ἐλπίδι is an adverbial form of speech; but we translate ὅτι with "denn", "for", "denn auch sie selbst, die Creatur, wird befreit werden, usw." ("because the creature itself also," etc.), & take this expression as a modifier of ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. That ὅτι is thus used in an explicative sense is proven by such passages as 1 Cor. 1, 25. According to the matter on hand it arrives at the same point. Some, as other expositors do, find the principal statement in v. 20, ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, confirmed by the sentence of the 21. verse. In any case here, in v. 21, the hope of good, which the creature expects, the great change to which God has subjected it in vanity, is more closely described. The creature also, like the children of God, shall be freed from the servitude of corruption. Φθορά is a stronger expression for "perishableness" ("Vergänglichkeit"), which had previously been designated as ἡ ταπεινότης. And the genitive τῆς φθορᾶς one takes most suitably as the genitive of apposition, even as the following genitive, τῆς δόξης. ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς is the servitude which consists in corruption. The creature, because it is subjected to the καὶ οὗτοι τῆς, finds itself in a condition of servitude, in that the

general disposition & corruption is something strange, an unnatural thing for it. Out of this condition of servitude the creature shall one day be translated into a more adequate condition for it, into the reverse condition. It shall be delivered to the freedom of the glory of the children of God, οἱς τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ τῆς σῶς ἡς αὐτοῦ τῶν υἱοῦ Θεοῦ. When Christ comes again in His glory, the children of God shall become partakers of His glory. And when the children of God are thus glorified & transfigured, then they have accomplished the fullest freedom. Their glory is at the same time freedom. Then they shall follow entirely their own inclinations, the inclination of the new, divine nature, which they have received in regeneration, to serve their God & Father, to praise & magnify God in all eternity with a free & joyful spirit, untroubled & unhindered by sin, weakness & death, with all the powers of body & soul. And the creature should & shall receive a share in the freedom and glory of the children of God. As they are now laden with the shame & the curse of sinful mankind, thus they shall then come to honor with perfected, transfigured mankind. All traces of perishableness & of death shall then be removed. The creature shall then be revealed as that which it is, as a creation of God. They shall live, move & act in conformity with their own power, their own nature in the service of God, their Creator, & shall reflect still more purely & beautifully than it was in the beginning, the honor & glory of God. This great change, which the creature shall experience, includes in itself the continuation beyond the end of the world. Still that does not contradict such statements of Scripture as 11 Pet. 3, 10-12. There it is only taught that the present stability of the world shall dissolve in the fire. "The disappearance of the world is the disappearance of its form. (1 Cor. 7, 31), by which its change is affected." Meyer. "Not the κόσμος, but only the οὐρανὸς τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου shall disappear, 1 Cor. 7, 31, and the fire of 11 Pet. 3, 10 is to be considered as a fire of purification & not of annihilation." Philippi. Out of the fire of the earth, out of the atoms into which heaven & earth have dissolved themselves, shall the new creation come forth rejuvenated, transfigured; out of them shall come the new heavens & the new earth, in which dwell all the righteous ones. 11 Pet. 3, 13.

What the Apostle has to say concerning the creature he closes with the words: Οὐ σῶμεν, ἅπα, ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις ὁυστεῖ & ἔσθι, καὶ ὁυυα σίλει, ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. V. 22. By means of, ἅπα this sentence joins itself to the principle statement of the section, vv. 18-22, the statement in v. 19, which is confirmed in v. 20 and v. 21, namely, that the creature waits for & expects the revelation of the children of God. As already remarked, Paul here personifies the creature. As real conscious waiting, expecting, hoping cannot be ascribed to the irrational, senseless creature. What the Apostle has in mind with this poetic description of Nature is the fact that a great change, a glorious future is imminent for it. That is a truth which God has revealed in this place through His Spirit to the suffering Christians, who need comfort. And also this fragment of divine truth must we accept simply in faith. Still we ourselves can perceive something of that, if we look into nature. We know that the Apostle writes thus, we can observe it ourselves, that the whole creation groans & moans, ὁυστεῖ & ἔσθι καὶ ὁυυα σίλει, and certainly ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν, from the beginning, that is, since it was subjected to the ματαίωσις, even until now. Ὁ σίλει are the pains of birth & then in general severe pains, and it is

questionable, whether in our passage the expression *ὁ Σίβειν* points to the fact that "the old *κτίσις*, as it were, is exerting itself amid severe pains to bring forth out of itself the new *κτίσις*," Philippi. The *ὁ* in both *verbis* designates, as, for example, also Philippi, Meyer, Weiss, Hofmann & Sutherland accept it, *genitum et dolorem communem inter se partum creaturae. Estima*. "The whole creation performs, as it were, a great symphony of groaning." Philippi. And we can become aware of that in some measure with our senses, & so we know something about it. What first of all meets our eyes is the *πῦρ αἰῶν* & *ὁ ἔσχατος*, to which the creature is fallen. But if we look more closely, if we consider nature more attentively, then we perceive "that their collective life passes thru a pain of anxious wrestling which demonstrates itself in their expressions of life with continuous jerks of death." Hofmann. Whenever we turn, there we discover how the creature struggles against the disadvantages and corruptions & experiences pain over it. The worm wriggles in the dust, when it is stepped on. The animals of sacrifice turn & howl under the sacrificial knife. Whoever understands & listens to the expressions of life of nature, receives everywhere either a loud cry of lament & woe or a muffled whining or complaint & groans. "Does not a common cry of pain, a painful moaning break forth continuously in all life in nature? Has not the ear of the poet heard this great cry of complaint in all ages? Has not its mouth always granted him expressions again? As Schelling once said: On a beautiful spring day, when nature unfolds all her charms, does not the heart absorb a poison of groaning melancholy, while it drinks in admiration?" Kodel. All that we see & hear, feel & experience; that we know from our own observation. And now we should know & believe what the apostle attests, thus the apostle applies the *ὁ ὅλος* & *ὁ ὅλος* and *ὁ ὅλος* of the *κτίσις*, that the pain & lament of the creature is a yearning & lament of pining, that the creature desires itself out of its misery & corruption & with tension & desire looks out for a better future, to the glory of the children of God. Thus in the lamentation & groaning, which we perceive, the waiting & watching of the creature for the revelation of the children of God proves itself. And because the ^{whole} creation in such a manner looks to & moves toward the freedom of the glory of the children of God, is a proof for the greatness of this glory. Because everything around us strives toward the same glorious goal, toward which we Christians reach out in hope, we can & should conclude what a beautiful share & inheritance awaits us there.

What concerns the history of the exposition of the foregoing section, as it is here still established that the explanation given here, the acceptance of a future change & glorification of the creature, is found throughout in the church fathers, among most Lutherans & Reformed theologians of the 16. century, for example, with Luther, Melancthon, with Koerner, the co-author of the Formula of Concord, & Brenz in their commentaries of the Letter to the Romans, in the old Bible works, like the Littenburger, & finally with the great majority of orthodox expositors of modern times. The dogmatists of the 17. century, who interpret the freedom of the creature from the servitude of perishableness as an annihilation of the creature, in that they as a rule agree

ially to 11 Pet. 3, must do violence to the words of Paul. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$, v. 21, cannot possibly be a designation of time in the sense: "at the time, when the freedom of the glory of the children of God enters in." The double modifiers of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$, which are introduced with $\alpha\iota\omega\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, mark significantly the translation of the creature out of one condition into another. And why should the line, of which Peter writes, be taken without as a fire of annihilation? No earthly fire is a fire of annihilation in the real sense of the word, which completely destroys the substance. The hellish fire does not terminate the existence of the condemned. So also the effect of the fire of the last day is not necessarily a reductio in nihilum. The melting, the dissolving of the old heaven & the old earth in fire corresponds rather to the death, decay, & dissolving of the human body, which notwithstanding shall be made alive again out of the dust, out of its atoms. We record here, finally several quotations from the renowned sermons of Luther on the Epistle of the fourth Sunday after Trinity: "Thus St. Paul makes out of all suffering on earth a little drop, & a small spark; but out of that glory, for which we should hope, an endless sea & a great fire." "If our parents in paradise had not sinned, the world would never have perished; but after they had fallen into sin & all of us after them, the whole creation must also suffer for us, & is now also subject to vanity & destruction because of our sins, & for 6000 years, which are nothing over against eternal life, these have remained subject to the condemned world & served it with all its advantages, until God shall pick them into a heap (as St. Peter's second Epistle, 3, 13, also teaches) & shall purify & renew the creation also for the sake of the elect. For the sun has now been nowhere so beautiful, bright & clear, as it was in the beginning, when it was created, but because of man it is half dark, rusty & beloued; on that day, however, God shall again cleanse & purify it by fire, 11 Pet. 3, 1, so that it shall be brighter & clearer than it had been in the beginning. But because it must suffer for our sins, & lighten the most wicked heathen as well as, yea, more than the devout, therefore it longs heartily for that day, when it shall be cleansed again & serve only the devout with its light. So also the earth would bear no thorns or thistles, if it were not cursed because of our sins; therefore together with all the creatures it longs for that day, so that it might be changed & renewed with them." "And it is very comfortingly spoken, so that he draws in the entire creation, as into one person, who has a desire with us to come out of this life into another. That we certainly know that we still do not live as we should, but expect another life, which should be our real life: as the sun expects another embellishment, which it should have, together with the earth & all other creatures: namely, that it should be cleansed from all abuse of the devil & the world." "Thus hence we have & the entire creation with us which also for our sake shall be purified & renewed in the most beautiful manner, so that one shall say: This is first a beautiful sun as fine, pretty tree, an exquisite, lovely flower, etc. Now because that, I say, is our hope, should we be so haughty, & the simple suffering, which might befall us in this life, consider not so great; for what is that over against the glory which shall be revealed in us?" In this manner also St. Paul speaks of the change of the creature in his second Epistle, 3, 10, 13, and says: "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise & the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless we look for new heavens & a new earth, wherein

dwelleth righteousness. And he would say: Just as now on earth the most part are unrighteous, who do not do the will of our Lord God, as it is done in heaven: thus on that day also on earth shall dwell real righteousness & holiness, that is, really devout, blessed, righteous people: & just as there is real righteousness in heaven & the devil is cast out: thus shall he be cast out from the earth together with all the godless on the last day, so that really holy people shall be in heaven & earth, who shall possess all things in complete joy. That is what St. Peter means, when he says: 'it looks for new heavens & a new earth, where-in dwelleth righteousness.' But St. Paul adds to that that not only we wait for that, but also the whole creation groans & cries with us & waits for that. "The creature knows that it shall not only be free from the service of the corruptible essence, but shall also be gloriously adorned & embellished; therefore it would gladly be there soon, undisturbed, as Jacobus de Marchis, also in *opus magnum* says: 'For it knows how beautiful it shall be, therefore it groans & is anxious for it; as we Christians also groan and would gladly from the heart that there would be almost an end to the Turks, the Pope, & the shameful world.' This interpretation of Luther needs no further interpretation on our part. Self-evident is that what he says regarding the fine, beautiful trees, of the exquisite, lovely flowers, etc., only as childlike, poetical descriptions of the conditions of the paradise on the new earth. Only one thing might still be said, that in the above Luther takes the *παλαιότης*, to which the creature is subjected, very correctly as "ferreting" (destruction). But then, when he explains the concept of waiting, and understands in that also the service, which the creature at the time of sin must render to the godless, then it is really questionable, whether the expression, *παλαιότης*, really contains also this thought in itself; on the other hand, it is beyond question, that this latter also belongs to the curse to which the creature is subjected.

VV. 23-27.

It is the Spirit who had returned from the future, to the present condition of the creature. In verse 23 he describes the present time of the Christians. *Ὁ μόνος δὲ*, as he continues, *καὶ ἡ πόλις* - *στεινάζει*. Not only the whole creation groans, but also we, as Christians, groan. There are found here many variants. On the other hand *ὁ μόνος δὲ* the words *ἡ πόλις* are more certainly found originally. On the other hand, behind the participial clause *καίπερ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες* Brethren: καὶ οὐτοί, καὶ ἡ πόλις καὶ οὐτοί, etc. and *ἡ πόλις* καὶ οὐτοί. The first reading, as accepted by most modern and recent expositors. The sentence in the text receives a different, although not essentially the same sense. To us the second reading, which has omitted the authority of the *ἡ πόλις* & the *καίπερ* clause, seems to fit best. For *ἡ πόλις* necessarily belongs to the *καίπερ* clause, as *καίπερ* is a conjunction, and the contrast between the believers & nature is to come forth. And to that *καίπερ* adds itself in the sense of "gleichfalls" (likewise, also) (Megaw). Thus it is the meaning: the one creature,

823-27.

Phil. 2, 21

We Christians wait for the adoption, for the redemption of our bodies. Nevertheless we still wait. That the present time is still a time of yearning & waiting is still brought before our attention very strongly by the following sentences, V. 24-25, which explain the ἔτι ἐκ δεξιῶν in v. 23. We translate ἔτι ὡς ἐκ δεξιῶν in v. 24 with Luther: "Nun wir sind wohl selig, doch in der Hoffnung" ("For we are saved by hope"). With the ὡς ὅτι, the apostle means in this context the ὥστε, i.e. in the pregnant sense of the word, the future, perfected salvation, that which we call "Heiligkeit", holiness, even that which he had previously designated as ἰσχυρισμός and ἀποδείξεις. We are already saved, have been made blessed, have become partakers of the salvation. The salvation has been merited & secured for us by Christ. Those who believe in Christ have eternal life, John 3, 16. But the emphasis here lies on the ἔτι ἐκ δεξιῶν, which is placed at the front. We take this expression with Bengel, Meyer, Hodge, Philippi & others in the sense of "Hoffnungswiese" (in the manner of hope). Bengel: Dativus non mediis, sed modis. Hodge: "The dative (ἐκ δεξιῶν) does not in this case express the means by which anything is done, but the conditions or circumstances in which it is, or the way & manner in which it occurs. It is therefore analogous to our forms of expression, we have a thing in expectation or prospect. Salvation is a blessing we have in hope." We are saved, we have salvation, but in the form of hope, in the manner & way that hope for the salvation which is still in the future, has proposed for us in the future. Then when it reaches further: ἔτι ἐκ δεξιῶν οὐκ ἐβόηεν ἔτι, "Hoffnung aber, die man sieht, ist nicht Hoffung" ("but hope that is seen is not hope"), v. 24b, then there ἔτι, "Hoffnung", hope, is used in the objective or passive sense. "In an energetic manner in all languages is the object of my hope designated as my hope." Philippi. "Wenn wir einen sehen, warum hofft er das noch?" ("For what a man sees, why doth he yet hope for?"). ὁ γὰρ βλεπόμενος τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἔτι ἐκ δεξιῶν, V. 24c. By means of καί the giving of the hope into sight is designated, which should appear as groundless. Meyer: It lies in the nature, in the concept of hope, that one still does not have before his eyes, does not see & enjoy that for which he hopes. Hope & sight exclude one another. When the seeing begins, then it is at an end with the hoping. And now out of this discussion concerning the essence of hope the Apostle draws the conclusion: ἔτι ὡς οὐ βλεπόμενοι ἔτι. Ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὅτι ἔτι σωροίμεθα. Ἀπελπίσθημεν ὅτι οὐκ ἐσθ' ἡμῖν. "Wenn wir also das, was wir nicht sehen, bekennen so warten wir in Geduld" ("But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it"). This state of things, that at the time we still do not see but hope, that salvation is at the time still an object of hope, not of sight, brings with itself the fact that we still yearn & wait. In this time we Christians are brought out of hope & thus

land into a growing, awaiting. Nevertheless, we wait in patience, really "under restraint" under patience, & "in hope", gladly & willingly bear all the suffering of this time, in that even the waiting flows out of the hope, which already bears in itself the blessings of the hope. Thus also this description of the present time of the Christians is added on in order to satisfy the suffering Christians & to reconcile them with their present lot & fate. Hodge very fittingly includes the content of the two verses, & adds to it the statement: "Salvation in this life is not a present good, but a matter of hope, & of course, future; & if, future, it follows, that we must wait for it in patient & joyful expectations."

When the Apostle continues in v. 23: $\text{Νοὐς ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν}$, "The heart is as the spirit", then so closely placed, this Person, the Spirit of God, at the side of the other two subjects, of whom he had previously spoken, the creature & the Christian, & says of the Spirit a thing similar to that of the latter. From v. 18 on he has explained that the creature yearns, & waits for & grows, that also the Christians, & hence grows, in that they wait, for, etc. And now he adds that the Spirit also grows in the same manner, like the Spirit of the present time is a time of growing. This expression concerning the Spirit in v. 23 branches out into the statement $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακαυχώμεθα}$. The expression $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$ evidently corresponds to the $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$ in v. 22 with the $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$ in v. 22. What is expressed concerning the Spirit before these words serves only to prepare them & to make them understandable.

It reads first of all concerning the Spirit: $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακαυχώμεθα}$. How many care it is to be read thus, not $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$. The Spirit takes upon himself our infirmities. That is as much as: takes upon our infirmities. $\text{ἡμεῖς ὡς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἀνακαυχώμεθα}$ means: to take someone to oneself; $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακαυχώμεθα}$ at the same time to lay one's hand to the work with someone whom one would help. This proper meaning fits very well into our passage. For it is as weak one whom the Spirit receives to himself, & as weak one to whom his movement is not entirely lacking, who cannot manage with his own power, but needs the support, the powerful assistance of a stronger one. Wherein our weakness consists, and how the Spirit helps our weakness, is explained more fully in the following.

" $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακαυχώμεθα}$ " (for we know not what we should pray for as we ought"). $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακαυχώμεθα}$ is more pertinent than the other, $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$, which otherwise says the same thing. According to the example of the ancient expositors, Philippi understands these words of the fact that the Christian, overcome by the feeling of his weakness, does not know how to correctly strike upon either the content (or) or the form ($\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$) of the prayer. But $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$ is one concept, the latter a modification of the former. Meyer explains: "We know not what we should pray for, accordingly as it is necessary, according to the measure of the necessity. The latter is the more closely designated instance, plainly & in general it is not known to us what we should pray for, but what according to the given circumstances makes the need to pray." But there too much is placed into the $\text{ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς}$. The meaning is simply this: We do not understand about that for which we should ask, thus to pray as

it is necessary, as it is proper, as it corresponds to the object of prayer. Similarly Hofmann, except that he refers to *καὶ οὕτως*, which lies further, to *οὕτως οὐκ ἔστιν*. And thus the meaning might much more be this, that we do not understand what we should pray for, as it is necessary to pray for that which would be prayed for. In general, however, it is an error of most extent that they think that Paul here speaks of prayer in general, of the weakness of our prayers, & of this, how the Spirit helps unto prayer, & thereby they go entirely out of the sphere of the thought of the Epistle. As, for example, also Weiss & Hofmann have recognized, it treats in the foregoing context of an entirely determined petition & prayer, of a completely settled object of the prayer, & that is the future salvation & glory. We Christians groan at the time, this groaning of ours, however, is at the same time also a waiting & at the same time also a prayer. We groan, yearn for a fulfillment of the adoption, for the redemption of our body, & pray & plead for that. Our groans rise up out of the depths of the heart to God. Thus we really know something of the *τί*, of the contents of our prayers. We have the promise of the future glory. But we still have no adequate concept, no suitable notion of the glory which shall be revealed in us. Our power of comprehension is weak & the promised glory is immeasurably great & momentous, that we cannot comprehend it correctly. From that it comes that the suffering & work at this time still oppress us so, often completely overcomes us, so that the view into the bright, happy eternity is darkened for us. And so it comes that our prayer in no way corresponds to its object, to the great blessing for which we wait. We groan, pray, implore well: "Thy Kingdom come!" But this praying & imploring is still so weak, often so feeble & impotent, as if the blessedness for which we pray were a very simple matter. "The distance between the need in which we find ourselves & the glory which we desire is so great that we cannot find the word of supplication to God, which suitably expresses the content of our yearning for redemption, which is so great for us." Hofmann.

That is our weakness, this weak groaning & prayer, which corresponds so little to the immeasurable content of our yearning for redemption. But the Spirit himself now takes on our weakness & certainly will that, that He enters in for us with unutterable groanings, *ὁ ἅγιος πνεῦς ἡμετέροις ὑποτάσσεται*. That the Spirit enters in (or makes intercession) for us, is shown sufficiently by the *ὑπὲρ* in *ὁ ἅγιος πνεῦς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, and the insufficiently attested *ὑπὲρ* *ἡμῶν* is really unnecessary. Most of the ancient expositors explain these words with Augustine thus: *quod spiritus quærens non facit*. And so also Philippi judges. And here the groaning of the sanctified spirit of man is traced back to its original author, the Spirit of God Himself. But the Spirit of God appears here not as the author of our groaning, but much rather as a subject of our groaning, as a Person who Himself groans. Should we read that the Spirit intercedes for us in his unutterable groanings, then that can mean nothing else than that the Spirit groans & with this groaning of His represents us. "The Spirit must groan, if He is supposed to represent our willing groanings?" And is supposed to understand the purpose of the Spirit (1. 2. 1). "Major. The Spirit is really also the author of our groanings; the Spirit works in the Christians all spiritual motives and acts, however, these are only

motion and action of the Christians, not of the Spirit. The Spirit works within us, but this faith is our fault, not the Spirit's fault. In our passage, on the other hand, Paul ascribes the groaning to the Spirit as subject & speaker of the Spirit's groaning. He coordinates, as already remarked, the groaning of the Spirit with the groanings of the Christians in v. 23 and thereby differentiates the former from the latter. The above mentioned explanation likewise does not agree with the expression *ἐν ἡμῶν τοῦ πνεύματος*. For that the Spirit makes us groan, teaches us to pray, is quite something else than that the Spirit lays in His petitions for us. The words of Paul present no other sense than that which also Meyer, Weiss, Hofmann & Lietz have brought to light, namely, that the Spirit groans & with this groaning of His intercedes for us before God. Certainly the Spirit of God groans in us. The apostle here describes an event in our inward parts. But, our hearts the groans of the Spirit arise to God. Man is an instrument of the groaning Spirit. We feel & experience something of this groaning & yearning of the Spirit in our hearts. They are also of times & places independent groanings, which our breast, our mouth brings forth. But there are groanings of the Spirit, which as Christians are can simultaneously hear his own groanings. The Spirit of God is an independent person, who speaks, teaches, & prays. As the Spirit of God bears witness to our Spirit, speaks to & convinces us, that we are the children of God, so He also speaks in the children of God and of their hearts to God, & prays for us. And because they are groanings of the Spirit, therefore they are unutterable groanings, too high & too deep for us. We really receive them into our inner parts, but we cannot grasp them in a concept & clothe them in words. The Spirit groans in us & with us, & this groaning is directed to the same object to which our groaning points, namely the groaning of the creature, namely the blessedness & glory of the children of God. And evidently He groans for the same not for Himself but for us. And so He intercedes for us with His groanings & prayers. He groans in us, with us & for us. The good Spirit of God has a heart full sympathetically with our weakness; He cannot, humanly speaking, see & endure it, that the children of God, in whom He has made His habitation, are so evilly regarded in this world, & so He enters into the arena for them & pleads for them, from God the end of their suffering, the glory. And with this powerful petition of His, which is certainly not very understandable, still is perceptible on our part. He supports us at the same time, He lifts up & carries our weak groanings & prayers, so that they do not cease entirely, but much rather finally reach their goal. There is no believing Christian who has not experienced something of this assistance of the Spirit, who has not tasted of this comfort of the Spirit. When the cross presses heavily, when we feel lonesome & forsaken here below, when we find no friend, no comforter, no man who correctly understands all our troubles & concerns for us, when our prayer & lamentation would not flow correctly, then we discover somewhat in our inward parts an indefinable, unexpressible plaint, groaning & yearning, which goes through marrow & bone, which really agitates the organs of the body, & it is a mighty groaning & lamentation, which even draws us out of our misery & gives us to taste the powers of the future world. It is as if another line, as stronger love took hold of our trembling heart & stretched it, raised it up to God, drew it with Himself to God, so

that we can now again looking to & pray to God more joyfully, more confidently. That is the support, the intercessions of the Comforter, of the Holy Spirit. But if we also do not feel & experience much of such things, then we still know from the mouth of the Apostle & should believe it, that He himself, the Spirit of God, dwells & works in us, that He speaks, groans, prays & with His groanings and prayers intercedes & will intercede for us, will stand by us, lift us up & bear us even to our final groan.

He Himself, the Spirit, intercedes for us with unutterable groanings. For God, however, the Apostle adds in 1. 27, this speech of His is very understandable. He who searches the hearts & thus sees what goes on in them, understands very well what the Spirit wills & means with His groaning. He knows that He intercedes for the saints in a manner agreeable to God. With Friedrich, Meyer, Hofmann & others we take 87. κκτλ βού Every ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι as an objection to τὸ τῷ πνεύματι τὸν θεόν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν as an object of 87. For these words can contain no basic declaration, since God, the Revealer of hearts, knows everything that takes place in the inward parts of man, also what is contrary to God; they can at the best establish why God assents & listens to groaning of the Spirit, but which otherwise must be expressed as τὸν θεόν. Concerning the ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, the representative groaning & prayer of the Spirit, attention brought to our attention here that it happens κατὰ θεόν. That does not mean: according to God means ing, will & pleasure, for only of man, of the Christian, but not of the Spirit of God can it be said accordingly. Thus He addresses Himself according to God's will & good pleasure. The κατὰ θεόν evidently corresponds to the κατὰ θεόν 87. Tim. 1. 5. 2. We Christians on our part do not understand how to plead & to pray for the future blessedness & glory, how it is becoming, how it is conformable to that great blessing. We still cannot correctly grasp that for which we hope. The Spirit, on the other hand, says, asks for us the glory κατὰ θεόν, as it is proper, or, what is the same thing, κατὰ θεόν, in a manner suitable to God & the glory of God. Similarly the adverbial modifier κατὰ θεόν in 1 Pet. 4. 14 is applied, where it says of the dead believers, that they live according to the Spirit in conformity with God, & ὡς κατὰ θεόν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, that is to God's blessed life & existence similar to God. The Spirit very well understands that which we do not correctly understand. He knows exactly what our hope is. He is at home in that world. He is Himself God & knows God, knows & sees the glory of God; the δοξα θεοῦ is His own, therefore He is also called τὸ τῷ πνεύματι τὸν θεόν, the Spirit of glory, 1 Pet. 4. 14. And in conformity with that He intercedes for us. With holy, divine earnestness, as it is fitting for the immeasurable, divine content of our hope, with the fervor of divine love He prays for us to God. He sighs after & obtains the divine glory for us by entreaty. God's Son, our Redeemer, our Advocate. That is our ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι κατὰ θεόν, when the Son says to the Father: "Father, I will that they also, whom Thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which Thou hast given me." John 17. 24. In a similar manner, with similar words the Spirit of Christ intercedes for them in whose hearts He dwells & whom He would fully prepare for salvation. The

helped: & who turn Christ men prepared a nation for all, calls to Christ thru the preaching of the Gospel all who receive this preaching. He sends out His servants, the preachers of the Gospel; & they invite into the great supper, in the marriage feast, all those whom they can reach with their voices, to take share in the salvation of Christ. Thus all men to whose ears the Gospel has come are κλητοί in the sense of invitation. And as the Lord uses the expressions κλητοί in Matt. 22, 14 and 23, 14. Unfortunately most men reject this call, this invitation of God & do not become obedient to the Gospel. But those who have complied with the call of God, who have accepted the Gospel in faith, have not done that of themselves. God has worked faith in them. Thru the preaching of the Gospel, in which He offers salvation to them, God has also called them inwardly, taken hold of their heart, their will, placed the word of consent into their hearts, & has called, drawn & brought them to Christ. "With His effective κλητοί, the Gospel has entered into them thru the heart." Lange. Thus they are κλητοί in the pregnant sense of the word, not only as invited, but as elect: & Quenstedt expresses themselves, as predestined, as such, who are held to their place by the call of God. God has called them, ἔκκλησεν αὐτοὺς, into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ, εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, so that they now have fellowship with Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. 1, 9. God has called them, κατέκλησεν, that is, translated them out of darkness into His marvellous light. 1 Pet. 1, 9. In the above quotation we see

defines the κλητοί in our passage very correctly as "the divine effect of grace, by which they are brought to faith & called to the Christian congregation." Only that one must combine this effect of grace with the outward vocation. For even thru the Word God has worked that in them. This divine effect of grace is identical with conversion. And by virtue of such a call those who have been made into Christians then become the beloved of God. The latter purpose of the call, however, is the blessed goal to which we Christians look. God has called us to eternal life, 1 Tim. 6, 2, to His eternal glory. 1 Pet. 5, 10; 1 Thess. 2, 14. Already in our call & conversion, when we became Christians, God had placed the future glory in prospect for us, had there placed our feet on the way of peace, the way which leads to eternal life. Therefore thru our call there is guaranteed to us the future glory & with that also this, that all things, even the sufferings of this time are helpful to us for glory. For God, who has called us, in faith, 1 Cor. 1, 9, & shall also certainly fulfill the promise to which we are called.

The security for the fulfillment of salvation, which is given to us in & with our calling, appears so much more firm & certain, since it rests on a purpose of God. We are called κατὰ πρόθεσιν, in conformity with a purpose, as a result of a divine purpose. Into this πρόθεσις men have placed all things possible. One takes the purpose of God somewhat as the general will & plan of salvation, as the decree of redemption, & at the same time as the establishment of the way of salvation & the means of salvation. That is sheer arbitrariness. The expression πρόθεσις states merely that God determined something, & that He determined must present itself from the context. In our passage κατὰ πρόθεσιν is combined with κλητοί. God had thus determined to call, to convert, to lead to Christ & thru Christ to save & with Christ to glorify even

those persons who are now beloved of God, who are now Christians, For with the call is this latter aimed at. And the calling is according to the carrying out of this divine purpose & decision. The calling is an historical event, falls in this present time. The divine purpose, which is realized in the calling, lies on the other side of time, is an act within God which took place before time was, a purpose which God had made by Himself in His eternal counsel, $\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$, $\eta\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\epsilon\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$, Eph. 1, 9, is $\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omega$ ν $\delta\iota\omega\nu\omega\iota$, Eph. 3, 11. According to the matter in hand, this eternal purpose is identical with the eternal election. And so it applies to that what I can state concerning the election, & its relationship to the calling: "Election and calling are inseparable correlate concepts; where the one is the other is also, only that one cannot understand the former as a pretemporal act within God, but the latter enters upon the vision as a historical fact." (Lutherischer für deutsche Theologie 1554, p. 79. We Christians should thus know that God, to speak with our Concessions, already from eternity "had ordained in His purpose ('Hiratz!') that & how He would bring us to Christ, to faith, to salvation, how He would bring us thither." And accordingly I have now been called, have been brought to Christ, to faith; & otherwise the final purpose of the calling shall fulfill itself in me, & I shall certainly in the future receive my share in the glory of Christ. For the eternal purpose of God, in which also my salvation is included, "can," as the Formula of Concord says, "not fail & be destroyed. It has a means proposed often comes to shame. But what God has purposed is carried out certainly & surely." The purpose, by virtue of which we Christians are called to Christ & to eternal life, is $\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omega$ ν $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\beta\omicron\nu\lambda\eta\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\beta\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, Eph. 1, 11, the purpose of Him who works all things & carries out what He has undertaken for Himself.

It is still to be pointed out that strictly Reformed theologians according to the precedent of Augustine place the called $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ in contrast to the called $\mu\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$. To that there then joins itself the Calvinistic dogma that, when the non-elected ones are called, this is not an earnestly intended & powerful call: that here the call had no effect, because the divine purpose was lacking. But that sort of differentiation of two classes of called ones, those who are called with a purpose & those who are called without a purpose, is foreign to the teaching of Paul, likewise it has no support in Rom. 8, 29. We have shown above that in this passage the word $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\iota$ has another, a narrower meaning, as, for example, in Matt 22, 16; 22, 14. Therefore one cannot place the $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\iota$, of whom the discussion is here, & the $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\iota$, of whom the discussion is there, into one category, cannot take them as one genus, which then falls into two species, those called with & those called without a purpose. In our passage, Rom. 8, 29, as in general in the apostolic letters, $\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\iota$ are those called to a place, are called, the converted. And of those Paul says in common that they are called according to the purpose. According to the instruction of the Apostle we Christians should regard our calling, our conversion so, that a deliberate eternal counsel & purpose of God had come to realization therein. It has not happened by chance that we, even we also have been called & converted to Christ, that we have come to faith. And if we correctly consider this grace which we have experienced & even also the eternal grace, correctly,

take it to heart, then we remain clinging with our thoughts with our hearts to this grace & then think not of the others who have heard the name & yet are still not converted & not saved. What his condition is with those who are written upon another page of the Bible. Where the Scriptures speak of the many who are also called, that is, the invitati, and are nevertheless lost, as, for example, in Matt. 20, 1 ff.; 22, 1 ff.; 23, 37, there they do not use the expressions $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$. Likewise not the contrasting $\mu\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$, there they do not in general operate with the purpose of God. There they state merely that God has called, invited these people thru the Gospel, & certainly correctly & powerfully, that God has neglected nothing on them, but has done everything that He could to save them, & that they on their part have hindered the effect of the Word, persistently resisted the Holy Spirit, who would also convert them, that they have not wanted & are therefore themselves guilty in their condemnation. And we should not treat saintly with this kind of mixture & mix nothing in of that which the Scriptures say in other places, in other connections of the called, who in a special sense, in a pregnant sense of the word are called $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\iota$.

When we now look over the following sentence, which is introduced with $\delta\iota\tau\iota$, v. 18-20, then it immediately appears to our eyes that the expressions $\pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$ and $\pi\rho\acute{o}\psi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ correspond to the $\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$ and $\epsilon\iota\kappa\eta\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ to the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\iota$ $\omicron\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$ in v. 12. It was mostly the expression $\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\iota\ \omicron\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$, and like-

wise establishes with this expression that everything is done for the best to those who love God. The Apostle speaks so indistinct here: $\omicron\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota$, because he would call to our attention that to those, to whom his first point applied, the second, the third, etc. also applied, that the divine acts named here hang closely together, form, as it were, one strongly joined chain. But it is evident that he has even those persons in view, whom he had previously called designated as called according to the purpose, as those who love God as children of God, even the persons who are now Christians, with whom he includes himself in the entire section, v. 18-29, in the $\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\eta\mu\omega\iota$, etc.

Concerning them he declares first of all: $\omicron\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\epsilon\tau\iota\nu$. Literally translated: whom He had previously known. A number of church fathers, the Lutheran dogmaticians of the 17. century & a good part of the modern theologians refer this expression to the "Präseience" of God & translate: "die es vorhergesehen hat" (whom He had foreseen), "zu vor gekannt hat" (known beforehand). But there the "Präseience" (foreknowledge?) of God includes all things, all men, good & evil, but here the discussion is only concerning those who are now Christians, & shall finally be glorified, therefore, in order to bring sense & understanding into this interpretation, one must supplement the text. The ancient dogmaticians explain: *quos credituros praescit* and thus

again their election intuitu fidei, even as Philippi 1 & 6: whom He had seen beforehand in this quality as believers; Meyer: "whom He knew beforehand as such who in the future would be on the way of His divine salvation" = $\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\ \alpha\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$; Weiss: whom He had seen beforehand as lovers of God. There are nevertheless completely arbitrary explanations, arbitrary glosses to the text. With the same right, that is, error, the Romanists resort to *fidei iustificamini*: scil.

arbitrate, formative. Even the principle matter must be added, invented. This explanation brought them
 ancient time belongs to the linguistic impossibilities & opens every door & gate to all arbitrar-
 inness in exegesis. Οὐς προέγνω is in itself a separate part of the sentence and προέγνω must be for
 itself alone a complete concept. It designates, like the following verbs, an act of God which has manifested
 & not an act of man about which God only knew, which He saw already beforehand, & certainly, as the text points
 out, even as προέβλεψαν, an eternal act of the will of God. Thus Augustine, Calvin & the Reformed, & also Luther &
 the Lutheran theologians of the 16. century, & among the modern ones, for example Huetner, Hübner, de Wette,
 Britzsch, Lange, Eichengrün, Hofmann, Scharbert & Bramer have understood the προέγνω. When Meyer &
 others, on the other hand, remark that this explanation offends the colloquial usage, then it is to be consid-
 ered what Lange writes: "The reminders of Meyer, that προέγνω is never in the classics never means any-
 thing else than the foreknowledge, is here, where we have to do with a θεός & εὐδοκία in the center of the
 Christian doctrine of salvation, without any consequence." In profane Greek the expression is used only of
 man's there also, or, for example, also II Pet. 3, 17 has significantly presented what one has known in
 advance. And when a personal object stands by it, then the meaning is that one already knows someone,
 from a former time. Thus Paul also speaks in Acts 23, 5: προγινώσκοντες με ἄνωθεν. This is an entirely
 different thing when the discussion is concerning a πρόγνωσις of God. Such a thing was en-
 tirely unknown to the Greeks, to the heathen, also in the sense of *praescientia Dei*. Yes, πρόγνωσις
 is a specifically Christian concept, nevertheless not a biblical terminus for divine foreknowledge.
 We must now, in order to determine the content of the concept exactly, examine the colloquial usage more
 closely.

It is not necessary that we enter into all the manifold definitions and "Begriffsinne" of the
 word γινώσκειν, or, for example, Bramer designates. It is sufficient that we establish the colloquial
 usage as far as it is of importance for our passage. And there is first of all a generally recognized
 fact, of which every Greek lexicon gives testimony, that γινώσκειν in classical Greek often designates
 a judicial verdict & also other decisions & decrees. The expositors quote as proof passages, for
 example, Herod. 4, 25; 1, 54. 25. Thuc. 4, 30; 3, 99. The substantiv γνῶμη means also "Bechluss" (decree)
 and γινώμην ποιῆσαι, "einen Beschluss fassen" (to pass a decree). Now it is well known in that
 that this meaning is not authenticated for the *compositum* προγινώσκειν. But that lies in the nature
 of the case, since a decree of man, which precedes time is thus eternal, never takes place, but is simply
 God's matter, & the heathen know nothing of divine eternal decrees. In biblical Greek, on the other
 hand, the meaning decree, decision, predetermination for προγινώσκειν is established by Acts 2, 23. We
 read there: τοῦτου τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ προγνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ σοῦ ἀπ' ἀντὶς εἰς
 γένη. καὶ ἀνέμων. τῶν πάντων ἀνέμων. Here τῶν ἀνέμων. τῶν πάντων ἀνέμων. καὶ προγνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ
 is one concept & thus πρόγνωσις is synonymous to βουλή. And evidently not the foreknowledge but

only the predetermination is God's basis & motive for the giving of Christ into death. From the beginning God had made the decree, had reached the decision to deliver Christ over into the hands of His enemies, & accordingly the Jews have raised Christ to the cross through the hands of the Gentiles. The Hebrews $\tau\epsilon\iota$ in Gen. 12, 9 and Jer. 1, 5 corresponds to the Greek $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ in the sense of decision, determination. In both passages $\tau\epsilon\iota$ is combined with a personal object. In the former the meaning is that God had observed, determined Abraham to the point ($\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$), that he would teach his children the way of God; in the second that God had decided upon, had chosen ($\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$) Jeremiah for His prophet. In the N. T. $\tau\epsilon\iota$ is used of a person, namely Christ, 1 Pet. 1, 9. The words $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\alpha\delta\epsilon\phi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\pi\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\sigma\mu\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho$ $\kappa\alpha\tau'\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$ cannot state anything else than that God had ordained Christ as Redeemer of the world already before the foundations of the world & then announced Him in His last time, permitted Him to come into the world. He is here defined $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ as an "act of the will, according to which God appropriated for Himself, in advance this person, who is called Christ." Only it is more probable that $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ in this place referred to an appropriation on the side of God, but means simply a predetermination. Any more expressive expression is the $\alpha\pi\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in Gal. 1, 4: $\alpha\pi\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\tau'\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon$, "in whom God intended not only Father of the living and the dead": "he was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick & dead". Corresponding to this usus loquendi, Luther more than later the $\sigma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ in Rom. 8, 29: "welche er zuvor verordnet hat", likewise even as Luc. 21, 36: "welche er erwählt hat", "welche die Formeln of Concord: quia praedeterminavit, elegit, Breng: quia praedeterminavit. And so altogether the Lutheran theologians of the 16. century. With this Luther, Ruckert, and Fichte agree. Fichte says: "also welche er erwählt Vorbestimmt gefant hat."

certainly the unmodified $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ designates an act of the will of God, a divine decision. Only thus does it gain some content. Still we must think of another colloquial usage, in order to understand the connection of the $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ with the bare $\sigma\epsilon\iota$. In the last quoted scriptural passages it is significantly presented to what God had designated or ordained the person concerned, Abraham, Jeremiah & Christ. In our passage there is found with $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ no such designations of person, which first comes near to $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$. Therefore we are here led to that pregnant meaning of the verb $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$, which we have already met in 7, 15. We refer to what was remarked there. $\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ in the N. T. like $\sigma\epsilon\iota$ in the L. T. now and then means as much as: "bestimmen, beordnen, zu! Heil werden lassen, mit jemandem Verbindung anknüpfen", "bestimmen, ordnen, erwählen, wählen". Bremer, who brings home to our mind several characteristic passages, in which God is the subject & man is the object of $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$, we read in Jos. 4, 9: $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, "much lieber, als ich erwählt habe, viel lieber noch, als ich erwählt habe" ("But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God"). With these words it is possible to remind the Christians of their conversions. That was the beginning of our Christianity, that we knew God,

have known & received God as our God, & thus have entered into communion with Him. Basically this
 γνωσθαι Θεόν is nothing else than α. γνωσθαι εν τω Θεώ. Only thus does one learn to know
 God, that one is known of God. God has known us, that means, He has us in view, turned Himself to us,
 laid hold of us with His Word & Spirit, worked in us the right knowledge of God, faith, & thus made us
 His own. This is an energetic, effective knowledge, a non sum effectiv. Luther: "Thus our knowledge
 is that we are known of God, who has also worked this knowledge in us (for he speaks of faith); thus
 He has known us first." "That is thus the meaning of the word, 'ye are known of God,' which means,
 you have been united thru the Word, you have been presented with faith & the Holy Spirit, thru whom
 you have been renewed, etc." A similar expression is found in I Cor. 3, 5: 51 & 52: ἵνα ἡμεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ
 ἴδωμεν ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν. To this Meyer remarks very fittingly: "The speech is pregnant. Instead of
 saying in logical minuteness of detail: thus in this is found, not only the knowledge in the correct manner,
 but also the being known of God takes place - only the latter is spoken, the greater, whereby the former
 is understood of itself. The ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν presents the great worth of the love; for when God knows
 a man, then there is thereby given not some indifferent & ineffectual relationship of God to man, but an
 activity of God, which passes over to the man, so that he experiences as an object of the divine knowledge
 also the effect of the intention, thus love, care, etc. For Beigebildet mit ihm der Mensch wird, so
 nur in unmittelbarer Erkenntnis des Menschen werden ein göttliches Erkenntnis, welche die cause
 enthält ist, so dass der Mensch erkenntende Gott die in seinem Nachdenken & wille. This
 gemeinschaft mit ihm nicht." And thus this is also the meaning in the well-known saying in I Tim.
 3, 15: "Εἰς τὸν Κύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, that the Lord has made those who now belong to Him into His
 own thru His effective knowledge. The continuing effect of this first knowledge, thru which we have
 become the Lord's own, is then that the Lord knows His own, the Shepherd knows His sheep, & is known of
 them, καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκονται ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν. John 10, 4. That is an intimate, inner
 communion of love, a non sum effectiv. A Christian should conceive himself with this & be certain
 that he knows Him (Christ) the beloved Shepherd, who knows him, that is, receives him as His sheep, cares
 for him, & would protect & save him. Luther. In the same sense, as the verb γινώσκω in the quoted
 passage, the verb ὁρίζω is used in I Cor. 2, 2: 100. 13, 5. Thru Jesus God speaks to Israel: ὁρίζω ὑμῶν
 τὰ ἑσθλά, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος ὡς ἐγώ. "Now each habe ich erkannt von allen Leuten, die ich
 kenne." ("You only have I known of all the families of the earth"). "ἴδωμεν" here does not mean to know
 (kennen), to learn to know, to take cognizance of someone (Erfügen), but to recognize (erkennen).
 The divine recognition, however, is not a mere taking notice, but energetic, taking man into its most
 inner essence; a laying hold & penetrating with divine love... and according to the matter similar to the
 election. "Heil." The result of that was that God already "recognized" (erkannte) Israel in the wilderness, as
 Moses writes, which means "sich seiner annahm" (interested himself in them), "showed His love & care for
 them." "Heil."

And now corresponding to that $\sigma\delta\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ in our passage states that God had taken into view us, even the persons who are now Christians in advance, in His eternal purpose & resolution, 'considered us in grace,' as it were, had directed us, 'fixed the mind upon us' (Hodge), had occupied us for Himself, had decreed us to Himself, & thus already made us His own in advance. But evidently this foreknowledge of God is not in the sense of an elective recognition, like that recognition through which we are converted, is still not a recognition which affects, grasps, & permeates its object. For the foreknowledge is a pre-temporal, eternal act of God, which is a decree, a concept of God. The persons whom God recognized beforehand did not live yet at the time when God recognized them beforehand. At that time they existed only in the eyes, in the decree of God, & in this eternal counsel of God God had thus appropriated us for Himself, adjudged & ordained us for Himself, so that in time, in the above described manner, we should become His own *de facto*. The adequate German translation of $\sigma\delta\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ might be: "wobei er zuvor sich ersehen hat" (H. 1: "whom he did foreknow"). $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ has the same sense in 1 Pet. 1, 2, where $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ modifies the concept $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\chi\alpha\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$. You are elected - that is the meaning here - according to that, that God the Father already in advance, from eternity had chosen you for Himself. Even those modern exegetes, who have thoroughly investigated the context; v. 20 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ agree with

) This explanation of $\sigma\delta\varsigma$ Hofmann writes: "Bitter ein Erkennen, welches etwas Anderes ist als ein Wissen oder Erkenntnis gegenwärtiger oder Sinnerworbener Beschaffenheit desselben, indem richtiges Erkennen ein ansehnendes, also Bekanntschafft mit Verwandtem begreifendes Thun ist, so muss auch dasjenige göttliche Erkennen, welches $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ heisst, ähnlich, wo dieser Ausdruck in seinem Vollworte und ohne ein Objectiv nach sich gebraucht vorkommt, in diesem Sinn gemeint sein und also ein Thun sein, welches sich auf dem Erkenntnisgegenstand, wie er war, ansehnungsweise gerichtet, ihn im Voraus zum Gegenstand eines Kennens, wie man das Verwandte und Gleichartige erkennt, gemacht hat." You here retains the concepts "verwandt" and "gleichartig", which also can be dispensed with, then that is naturally to be understood so, that the appropriating recognition of God makes the object of the recognition analogous & related to the recognizing subject. Bremer translates $\sigma\delta\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ in Rom. 8, 29: "mit welchem Gott im Voraus eine Gemeinschaft eingegangen."

But those whom He previously chose for Himself, "that exact government, sich geduldet zu sein dem Bild eines Sohnes" (the one did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son'), $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ is now the real term for predestination & is in

itself no independent concept but is always combined with a modifier, which shows to what someone is predestinated. Both expressions, $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$ and $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\omega$, describe one & the same eternal decree of God, therefore here $\kappa\alpha\iota$ the $\tau\omega\varsigma$ is lacking, but according to different rules the first contains the reference to God, the latter to the goal. The accusative $\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is grammatically an accusative of the predicate, actually designation of the person & goal. Those whom God had chosen beforehand, He has also designated

beforehand, that they should be conformed to the image of His Son, should be similar in their outward form and appearance to the image of His Son, who through suffering has entered into glory & whose divine glory now also shines forth out of His physical form & appearance; that they should bear the image of His heavenly man, 1 Cor. 15, 49; that their perishable body should be glorified & should be similar to the glorified body of Christ $\alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omega\tau\iota\tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ Phil. 3, 21. This designation of purpose is modified by the following words: $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\omicron\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The expressions $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\omicron\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ do not point to the fact as many commentators would have it, that Christ is the original & essential Son of God & that through Him we have become children of God & do declare Him. From the verse supplement $\tau\omicron\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omega\tau\iota\varsigma$ the future status glorified is merely described. The meaning is much rather that in the great family of God, in the multitude of His selected children of God, Christ should occupy the position of the only Son, as a father and prince. He is certainly the prince, $\alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$, of our salvation, who leads many children with Him to glory. Heb. 2, 10, that is the content: "leading of the divine predestination; a great troop of blessed, glorified, redeemed men, which singeth and about the glorified, perfect Son of man, the God-man. We who are new creations are thus predestinated to glory. God will & has firmly established that those whom He has chosen for Himself & elected as His possessions shall at one time also see His glory & become servants of the glory of Christ. Our future glorification rests upon an eternal decree of God & surely upon a firm, immovable foundation. And even for that reason everything, even cross & suffering, must have its own good, must result in salvation, in glory. The meaning of the $\alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega\sigma\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ etc. concerning the conformitas crucis, which is found in many ancient expositors, does not fit correctly into the individual expressions, which the Apostle has mentioned here, & does not fit into the context. That our cross & suffering is varied & different from the beginning by God still does not give any basis for the fact that the cross leads to glory. The basis of the statement in v. 25a, given in v. 29, the certainty of the future glory, leads to that place likewise, when one bases the same on the previous fields, on the foreknowledge of the subject's human conduct.

" $\eta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$." ("Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified.") Thus the Apostle continues the discussion, in which it is manifestly to be seen closely upon another. Those whom God had predestinated & chosen for Himself beforehand, them He also has called, that means, according to the remark made above on $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ to call to Christ, to draw to Himself, to bring to faith. With the calling, with conversion, justification is given & established. Those who have come to faith God has also justified, glorified & accepted them as His beloved children. Thus those whom He has chosen, is Himself previously & by fact become His own men. $\eta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ("and whom he justified, them he also glorified"), $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, that is as much as already glorified. The glorification is certainly still in the future, but it can

with definite persons, $\sigma\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, concerns "each & every person of the elected ones", as the Formula of Concord expresses itself: "god only owns the children of God, who are elected & ordained to eternal life." Yes, these persons are the children of God, those who love God, those who are now Christians. In the apostolic letters the expressions "Heiliger", "Heilige", "Heiligt", and "Auserwählte" are used altogether pro viis. And in our Lutheran confession the other names: "Christians", "children of God" alternate with the title "Elect." When the scriptures speak of the elect, of those whom God has chosen before hand and has ordained, we should think of the believing Christians & include ourselves in the number of the elect. And when the scripture speaks of the Christians, the believing children of God, then we should identify the same with the elect. Certainly only those are the elect who continue in the faith unto the end & are finally glorified. But the scriptures consider & describe the believing Christians throughout as persons whose continuing characteristic is faith & who also receive the end of faith, the salvation of their souls. And even the explanation of the Third Article states the Christian Church or the congregation of saints or believers as "the entire Christianity," which the Holy Spirit "has called, gathered, enlightened, & sanctified — and kept with Jesus Christ in the one true faith." To be sure, experience teaches that many who have come to faith fall away again sooner or later; and the scriptures earnestly warn against apostasy & also speak of seasonal believers (zeitliche Gläubiger). But what has to do with the seasonal believers stands written upon another page of scriptures, which is a truth for itself, which we should not mix into the expressions of scripture concerning the election of the children of God, which only treat of the persons who believe and are saved, the eternal election or predestination, which refers to specific persons, is therefore according to the concept, as according to the essence differentiated from the decree of redemption or the establishment of the way of salvation, as well as, from the general gracious will. "The decree of the eternal election is included in itself that God chose, from himself, selected for His possession & predestinated to heavenly glory each & every person of the elected ones, thus also us, also me, before the foundation of the world, that He had firmly purposed to save even these persons & them also in time to lead them along the way of salvation, to call & justify them. And this purpose of God cannot fail. In conformity with this purpose He has called, converted, & justified us, & we shall certainly finally glorify us. Our calling, conversion, justification, & maintenance is a carrying out of the eternal decree & purpose of God. Or in other words, in order to speak without expression, the eternal election of God is the cause not only of our salvation, but also of our calling, conversion & justification. Faith flows out of the election, & not turned around, the election out of faith, out of the presentis fidis. And therefore we Christians should reason ex posteriori from our calling, conversion, & justification to the eternal election, to recognize the election in our calling & justification & thus to become certain of this, that we also belong to the elect & shall receive the eternal glory. This apostolic doctrine concerning the eternal election, which has come to expression in Rom. 8:29-32 & is confirmed by similar scripture passages, as Eph. 1:3ff.; 1 Thess. 2:13ff.; 1 Tim. 1:9; 1 Pet. 1:2, is very comforting

for us Christians. When we are anxious & troubled about our salvation, then we should know that God from eternity has taken into His almighty hand our salvation & everything that belongs to it, thus also our faults. And this doctrine grants special comfort to the Christians in distress & suffering. When the sufferings of this time press heavily & almost overwhelm the soul, when it appears as if God had forsaken us, then we should say to ourselves that God already before the time of the world had chosen us, even if we, looked upon as unworthy, & chosen us for His possession, which He certainly will not refrain from doing. When the cross comes to temptation, when it appears as if God is arguing with us, then we should say to ourselves, that God from the beginning has only meant it well with us & has chosen and ordained us to an eternal glory & that therefore also all the severe experiences of this life only lead us onward toward the goal, which God from eternity has firmly established in its place. If we here with our thoughts remain only in the sphere of thought of the Scriptures, & correctly apply & grasp to our hearts the comfort of the Scriptures, then we do not think of others with whom there is another condition, then we feel no tendency to speculate over the why, order, or the eternal predestination & remain protected against the dangers which such speculation of the reasons includes in itself.

V. 31-39.

The Apostle continues in v. 21: *Τί οὖν ἐπομυνε στίγ τῶν τῶν*: "Was sollen wir denn hiergegen sagen?" ("What shall we then say to these things?"). What follows from this? In this entire last section of the chapter, v. 31-39, he amplifies what presents itself for the Christians, from that which was spoken previously, from the eternal decree & purpose of God & its fulfillment in time. It follows, from this: *Τί οὖν θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐνίκησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ τίς ἡμῶν*: "Wenn Gott über uns und wir nicht wider uns?": "If God be for us, who can be against us?". First of all it follows that God is for us, stands on our side. "God, who has designated us to glory & carries this determination onward towards its realization with a sure hand, can only be for us." Weiss. But from that it follows again: "Who can be against us?" The self-supplied answer is: "No one. Paul does not deny that the Christians still have enemies, but that these enemies cannot lay anything to their charge. *Τίς ἡμῶν ἐναντίον*; is a triumphant question & has the sense: Who will rise up against us with success? Who can do us harm? Non negat Paulus, prores hostes esse Christianis existimare esse - illud affirmat, adeo non vel acerbissime inimici aduersus eos, quos deus pro-

legat, contra successura esse, ut eos contemneret, et pro nullis putare licet. Fritzsche. "It is a question not of defiance (Hofmann), to which the following does not agree, but of the certain already triumphant certainty, that all hostile powers must be unsuccessful & unarmful for us." Weiss. Yes, since we have God on our side, therefore no one can harm us - or more s. exactly: be obstructive to salvation. For in the entire context it treats of the future salvation & glory. The enemy seeks to make

308,
8, 31-39.

salvation questionable for us. But even without surety, because the God, who has designated us to glory, is for us, & no one is able to accomplish anything against God. God will not permit that anyone should take salvation from us.

Ὁγε τοῦ ἱεῖος υἱὸς οὐκ ἐδέξατο, ἀλλ' ἵνα ὅτι ἡμῶν τὴν τὴν παρὲς ἡμεῶν ἀποδοί, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν τὰ πάντα ἡμεῖς ἐστίν; "Er, der seinen eigenen Sohn nicht verschont hat, sondern hat sich für uns alle dahingegeben, wie sollte er uns nicht auch mit ihm Alles schenken? (He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?). V. 32. The question introduced with ἡμῶν joins itself most easily to the preceding relative clause, if one takes this as protasis, as a paraphrase of the subject. The epistle here again points to the highest proof of the love of God. God has not spared His own Son. The expression recalls Gen. 22, where God says to Abraham: "How hast thou withheld thy son, thine only son." It was a unique sacrifice, since Abraham did not withhold his own son out of love to God. But that is only a weak image of the incomparable sacrifice, which God has brought to man out of love. Christ was & is the only ἱεῖος, Son of God; with right He calls God His own Father, ἱεῖος πατέρα, John 5, 18. He is born out of the essence of God, the only Son of this kind, the μονογενής, John 3, 16, and therefore the beloved Son of the Father, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, Gal. 3, 20. Him God has not spared, but delivered Him up for us all, gave Him into death. Here, as everywhere in this entire section, where he speaks in the first person of the plural, Paul includes himself with all the believing, elected children of God. Fritzsche: Nam de christianis Paulus loquitur disputat 1 v. 23. 31. 33. 35 ff. Christ is certainly the atonement for the sins of the whole world. But the believers are those who draw to themselves & apply to themselves this love & this proof of the love of God & thus say: Christ has died for us. The ἡμῶν ἡμῶν is to be understood here even as in v. 31, since the great love of God is here evoked. God has given His Son into death for our benefit. Certainly the death of Christ, when one looks into the matter, comes to our good only then, when Christ has suffered death in our place. And because God has done that, how should He not also with Christ give us all things? The words καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν belong together, quidni etiam. The Son of God appears here as the greatest gift of grace, all other things as accompanying supplements... the latter cannot be lacking, if one has received the former. We take in τὰ πάντα not with respect to all things, the future world, but as an ideal which we still wait for & hope from God, but think thereby certainly according to the entire context, especially of the future salvation & glory. They can be had not as any other. God has done the greatest thing & has given His Son. There is displayed here the same argumentation as in 5, 6 ff., where Paul had concluded from the highest proof of the love of God, the death of Christ, our atonement on the future καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, as major ad minus. Thus this statement in v. 32 serves as a confirmation of the preceding v. 31.

The question ἡμῶν ἡμῶν, which governs the entire section, is now divided up into several

individual questions, "whose triumphant answer shows how little the called need to fear any antagonists."

We see the continuation of thought in the following verses. God has very correctly defined them: "The three following questions are only somewhat altered applications of the same in v. 31: 'Who can be against us?' The first two (vv. 32, 34) refer to attacks of a juridical nature; it deals with enemies who contest the claims of the believers on forgiveness & salvation. The third (vv. 35-37) refers to a powerful attack, in which the enemy resorts to brutal force in order to destroy the bond between Christ & the believers. The entire passage reminds strongly of Isa. 52, 7-8: 'I know that I shall not be ashamed. He is near that justifies me; who will contend with me? let us stand together: who is mine adversary? let him come near to me: behold, the Lord God will help me; who is he that shall condemn me?'

The next question reads: τίς ἐγκρίσει ἡμᾶς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ; "Wer wird die Überwältigten kühn beschuldigen?" ("Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?"). v. 32. The meaning is: Who shall & can accuse the elect with success so that their complaint shall be accepted? The Christians, to be sure, have opponents who accuse them. "The question is completely general & thus includes all earthly, hostile powers, Satan, Law, conscience, world, etc., without wishing to designate anyone of them or to point them out exclusively." Philippi. The enemies mentioned accuse the Christians before God, & they also condemn their complaint. The believing Christians are still not entirely without guilt. We all sin daily & continually, & we do much against the Law of God. And these sins & transgressions of our Law, the real accuser, brings before God's tribunal. Our fellowmen complain that we have offended them often & severely. Our own conscience declares us guilty. Nevertheless these complaints are untenable. The Apostle shows that already by the fact that he calls the accused the elect of God. Thus he here designates those whom he had previously called ἡποεὐνοῦμενοι and ἡποπρωῖμενοι, because God had chosen them for Himself out of the world, out of the masses perditas. John 15, 19. "The elect of God are beyond all complaint. If the God has once taken them to Himself, let whoever will bring against them whatever he will, it cannot do them any injury, they cannot incur the loss of that upon which their election gives them expectancy." Hofmann. "The accusation is dashed to pieces in the Θεός & Σικάνω." "Sollst du, du da gerecht sprichst?" ("Is God that justifies?"). Those whom God has chosen for Himself & predestinated to glory He has also called & justified.

Thus the hostile law is written previously. And thus justification appears here also as a result of the election, as a characteristic of the elect of God. God, who is the Judge in this matter, gives no audience to the complaint against His elect, but pronounces over them an acquitting judgment. He does not condemn their transgressions & daily & richly forgives them all their sins for His Son's sake, whom He had given into death for them, for the atonement of their guilt.

It reads further: τίς δύναται κατακρίνειν; "Wer ist es, der da verdammt?" ("Who is he that condemneth?"). v. 34. Who is able to condemn the elect of God? The parallelismus membrorum demands that we take these words as an independent question & not, as many expositors do, as an addition to Θεός &

ΣΙΝΗΤΩΝ. Even so it clashes with the structure of the discourse, when one finds hereby the way to dismiss the thought whether God or Christ would condemn us. No, ὁ καταγγίλλων is the same person as ὁ ἐγκλησις. It is certainly only a formal rhetorical separation & division of thoughts belonging close together, that the accuser would differentiate from him who condemns & would place the first one, God the Judge, once against the second one, Christ, the Advocate of the accused. The description of this unique process is completed here. Every opponent, who would accuse us before God because of our continual sinning, intends to condemn us with this complaint of his, to procure for us from God the judgment of condemnation. Every judicial complaint aims at this, that the accused would be condemned. And certainly every sin, even when it is committed by a Christian, is in itself damnable & shuts man out from God & salvation. Nevertheless our adversaries do not gain their purpose. "Christus sic ex deo datus est nobis, ut melius ab eis aufereretur nobis" ("It is Christ that died, yet rather that is risen again"). ἵνα τοῖς ὁ καταγγίλλων, πᾶσι τοῖς ὁ καταγγίλλων. The word ὁ καταγγίλλων is the improbatum, by which the speaker proves himself. "Self-evidently this entire asseveration of the corrective expression is here only of a formal nature, serving the fact that the two phrases come forth correctly marked in their important correlation" Weiss. If Christ has died the death of the sinner only as an ordinary man, then certainly His death is of no benefit to us. By His resurrection He has been powerfully proven as the Son of God & His death as effective of atonement & salvation. Cf. 4, 25. The emphasis, however, lies on the two following modifiers: "welcher auch zur Rechten Gottes ist, welcher auch für uns eintritt" ("who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us"), ἐν τῇ ὑψίστῃ. Christ now sits at the right hand of God, with God of equal power & honor, is very near to God, He possesses God, is able to do something with God. And when He therefore intercedes for us before God, pleads for us, when we sin, cf. 1 John 2, 1, then this petition of His certainly cannot fail of its goal. The intercessio Christi is the continual pleading of His bloody merit before God & to be taken not only as realis, but likewise as vocalis et oralis.

Thus all the "judicial attacks" of our adversaries prove themselves as vain & fruitless. They can accomplish nothing against us with their accusation & condemnation, cannot dispute our salvation, to which we have been abashed by God from the beginning. The worst enemy of our salvation is sin, which still always clings to us. Even that gives our adversaries occasion for complaint & condemnation. Still this proof of guilt is & shall be invalidated & deplored by Christ's death, atonement & intercession. And thus the final result, the concluding sentence in this procedure is: God, the highest Judge, speaks, declares, & regards us as justified. Where the matter rests in eternity. To the just, however, belongs salvation.

In the following verses the Epistle contains reports of attacks of another kind, of "indirect attacks" (Erdl), which are pointed directly against our person, while the attacks of indirect kind are indirectly against our person.

come it. Still this is not in our own power, but "Christ der unsere geliebte hat" ("Christ who loved us"). The genitive *Sich* *ist* *in* *unserer* *Hand* is better attested than the accusative *Sich* *ist* *in* *unserer* *Hand*. Christ, who has loved us & given himself for us & who now sits at the right hand of God & has all the hostile powers in His hand, protects & strengthens His own, the elect of God, with His strong arms, with His divine power, & holds them firm in His Word & faith. Thus we continue in faith, because Christ maintains us in faith. The perseverance of faith is the Lord's work & action. The same connection of thought, which we have presented here, is established by Weiss, when he writes: "Even because the love of Christ gives us the power in itself to overcome everything which would separate us from it or the divine love & thus makes the individual case, in which we can no longer experience this love (because we have fallen from faith), an unnecessary one, nothing can separate us from it."

The certainty that suffering & tribulation cannot separate us from the love of Christ, however, rests upon the other certainty, that nothing in general that belongs in the realm of the created, i.e., nothing in existence, can separate us from the love of God in Christ. This latter statement, VI. 32, 33, the Epistle in connection with *Thi* *ist* *ein* *mal* *in* *unserer* *Hand* ("I am persuaded"), firmly convinced, persuades us, even in the face of tribulations (Engel). This conviction, however, was not grounded on some special revelation, which some have had been inserted to him personally, as it is now supposed in a foolish manner, but Paul speaks here also in the name of all believing Christians, & certainly in the first person of the singular, because he would hereby dispose every individual Christian to speak thus with him: I am certain, even for my own person and I entirely certain of this: *Dass* *weder* *der* *Tod* *noch* *Leben* ("that neither death nor life"), neither the death of which his discussion was in V. 34, nor the earthly life with its changes, *weder* *Engel* *noch* *Herrschaffen* ("nor angels nor principalities"), *ag* *gar*, the latter in higher order of angels, thus also not to be taken hypothetically, the angels, these higher spirits, who are stronger than all visible creatures, as in Gal. 1, 2, if they wanted to & would tempt, *weder* *das* *ewige* *noch* *zukünftige* ("nor things present nor things to come"), neither the present time, which is often burdensome for us, nor the difficulty which the future might bring, *nach* *Macht* ("nor powers"), *sondern*, which, if it is genuine, hangs together closely with the following expression, *weder* *Höhe* *nach* *Tiefe* ("nor height nor depth"), no adverse fate from above & no loss of power from below, which proceeds from the powers hostile to God, even the evil spirits, *nach* *was* *ein* *mal* *in* *unserer* *Hand* ("nor any other cause"), shall be able to separate me, or rather, since the individual Christians include himself with his fellow Christians, who are of the same conviction, *wird* *uns* *scheiden* *können* *von* *der* *Liebe* *Gottes* *in* *Christo* *Jesus*, *unserm* *Herrn* ("shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord"), from the love of God, which God has given to us in Christ Jesus, our Lord & Savior, & still continually grows, as fuller expressions for the "love of Christ." Nothing, nothing in all the world, can & shall tear me, us away from the love of God in Christ, from God & Christ; nothing, nothing can & shall cause our faith, our trust in God to waver.

"The same love of God & of Christ, in which we stand, helps us so that we remain in it. And therefore it cannot fail that we succeed to the goal of determination, which God pre-temporally counsel decreed for us & whose realization is already so far advanced." Hofmann.

The certainty of the future blessedness or the certainty of salvation thus also includes therein itself, that a Christian is certain of this, that he shall remain in the love of God & of Christ, with whom he is bound in faith, or, spoken in short, that he shall continue in faith. This certainty bases itself on the eternal counsel and purpose of God, as the Epistle declares the entire angel's election from v. 31 on from that which was said in v. 28-30, and as he then designates in this section, v. 32, the Christians as the elect of God. The formula of Concord very much in accordance with the matter combines the two statements in v. 28 and v. 32, 33 into the sentence: "Because we are called according to the purpose of God, who shall likewise create us from the love of God in Christ!" Those whom God has chosen for himself from eternity & has predestinated to glory, He has also called & justified, & thus He also maintains in faith & gives them the victory over all the enemies of their faith, v. 37. Certainly the same Apostle, who has written the 1st & 2nd Cor., in v. 38, warns the Christians in other places, in another connection, against apathy, also in this letter to the Romans, e.g., II, 10-12. This warning is meant for the Christians who would become proud, certain & careless, & is finally benefited

by necessary for all Christians, because they all still have the faith in themselves. But upon this warning, tempted Christians, who are troubled about their salvation, the Epistle bestows real consolation & comforts them in this way, that he assures them that no tribulation, in general nothing in the whole world can wrest from them their faith & salvation. And this consolation applies to all Christians, for there are no Christians, who are not careful about their salvation. Both things agree very well with one another, that the Christians on the one hand work out their salvation with fear & trembling, and they could lose it at any moment, & hold their faith in bounds; on the other hand, in spirit & faith certain of their salvation & of this, that they shall never fall away from the comfort of the correct faith. This certainty is the opposite of fleshly security & is no mathematical certainty, but an certainty of faith, an integral part of the Christian, who calculates thus: Today I stand in faith, but who knows what it shall be in the morning? In the end I shall suffer shipwreck in my faith, before I reach the goal. Such an one does not have the right Christian faith. Faith is certain of its course & of its goal. For the believer the possibility that he would even & for always cease, that he would ever leave Christ, is an untenable thought. A believing Christian is certain of five things, that none can displace the goal for him, & that he also on his part cannot miss the goal. He depends & trusts unconditionally in the all-powerful divine

Word, in which his eternal election which cannot fail is revealed to him & in which God has promised him that He shall maintain him in faith unto salvation by His own power. This certainty comes not from flesh & blood, but is, even as faith in general, a work, a miracle of God in man, a divine certainty & created by God, which therefore shall be master over all the dangers, which lie in one's own flesh & blood, & maintains the upper hand over all fear & doubt.

Already at the end of the second part of his letter, chap. 5, the Epistle is laid pointed to the future glory, as the result & fruit of justification. At the end of the third part, where he deals with the Christian's cross, which also belongs in the Christian's life, & calls attention to the comfort in the cross, he holds the thoughts of his readers for a while firmly with the looking out into the heavenly glory. He comforts them with the greatness & with the certainty of the future glory. Glory, however, is not only an end & issue of the Christian's suffering, but in general an end & goal of his way of salvation, which he lives the last followed from step to step. And in the second half of our chapter & especially the closing part, vv. 31-39, is a fitting conclusion to the entire previous presentation of doctrine, as there also the central dogma of justification is again brought up here. The discussion of the Epistle here comes to an end with an epilogue, which belongs to the most magnificent which has become available & known in human language. Augustine quotes this passage as an example for the *grandis elocutio generis*. The blind Erasmus cried out in astonishment: *Quid inquam libro sit grandiloquentius?* "His powerful rhetoric, however, is the only correct form for the exalted, elevated content. For what we read here is not ordinary speech & eloquence, but a "beliger hymnus" (beliger hymn), which is inspired by the spirit of God, & with it all who pray it after Paul as to the heights of heaven. It is a hymn of victory & triumph, with which a believing Christian overthrows & reads upon all enemies of his faith & salvation, & ever upward to his God & his Christ & firmly clings to them, until the triumph of faith passes over into the triumph of eternity, of glory.

The summary of the entire section, 8, 18-39, we can finally put into the words: The Epistle reminds the Christians of the fact that the present time is a time of suffering, that they must now suffer, wait in expectation, wait, groan & pray, & comfort themselves with the future glory, & certainly with the greatness & the certainty of the glory.

Chapter IX.

9, 1-13. Israel after the flesh and Israel of the correct nature.

The discourse of the Epistle begins anew, after he had presented the content of his Gospel from every side. What he would now say he introduces with the asseveration: *Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἵστημι ὑμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ*. That does not mean: I swear by Christ. For *ἵστημι* & *ἐγὼ* & *ἵστημι* is not the same as *ἵστημι*, and *ἐγὼ* & *ἵστημι* for itself alone is not like *ἵστημι* & *ἐγὼ*, a form of an oath. He stands with *ἵστημι* & *ἐγὼ* as a witness in Christ (I stand in Christ). Paul attests that he speaks the truth, and certainly in Christ, in his communion with Christ, so that he thereby confirms his communion with Christ, not only as an honorable man, but as a Christian: a servant of Christ, as every Christian confirms his relationship to Christ, his Christian faith with everything that he says & does. That includes

9, 1-13.
(1-5)

that he live, & preserve, with that which he would now state. But moreover, in order to confirm his assertion, he still appeals to the testimony of the conscience, although it is really understood of itself that everything that a Christian speaks & does as a Christian stands in harmony with his conscience. He writes: ἐν ὑμῶν τῶν ποτὶ τὴν ἐνδοκίμωσιν, "Indem mir Zeugnis gibt mein Gewissen (my conscience also bearing me witness)". i.e. take, ποτ. not in the sense of "mit mir", but only in the sense of "mir", and ἐν ὑμῶν τῶν ἐνδοκίμωσιν as strengthening, ὑμῶν τῶν ἐνδοκίμωσιν. For my conscience only gives witness to me myself, how it stands with me, not to another person. Certainly there is also an erring conscience. But Paul is conscious that his conscience is here ruled by the Holy Ghost, who dwells in his heart, therefore the testimony of his conscience in this case is completely reliable. Thus he continues: ὅτι ἡ ἐνδοκίμωσις ἡ ἐνδοκίμωσις. What he so holy & faithfully asserts is that he "große Traurigkeit und wehleidenschaftlichen Schmerzens" in seinem Herzen heftig. "That I have great heaviness & continual sorrow in my heart". i.e. What continually sorrows & troubles him is made known in the following words: ὅτι ὁ ἁγίος ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐπιτίμωσιν ἐμὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ὁ ἁγίος ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐπιτίμωσιν ἐμὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ὁ ἁγίος ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐπιτίμωσιν ἐμὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. "Denn ich wünschte selbst verbannt zu sein von Christo für meine Brüder, meine Verwandten nach dem Fleische" ("For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh"). Paul's brethren & kinsmen according to the flesh, the Jews, are ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This expression has the same sense here as in Gal. 1:8, 9; 1 Cor. 14:22; means the same as the Hebrew בָּרֵךְ, "Bann" (ban), "Fluch" (curse), & certainly concretely "verbannt" (accursed), dedicated & fallen to the wrath & curse of God. It is modified by ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "von Christo weg" ("from Christ"). The Jews are under the ban of God, because they are shut out from Christ & the salvation in Christ. It pains & annoys the Apostle that his own people are excluded from the salvation which also in this letter he had preached, which he had recommended to Jews & Gentiles. And that entered his heart so deeply that he wished himself to be accursed & condemned from Christ for, in the place of, his brethren according to the flesh. The imperfect ὅτι ὁ ἁγίος ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐπιτίμωσιν ἐμὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the same imperfect which is found in conditional sentences which establish an impossible condition. The bare imperfect is stronger than if it stood with it. Gal. 4:20. "I wish, para. 42, 2: 'ellem ego, si fieri posset. If it were practicable, Paul would deposit his own salvation in order to save his brethren from condemnations. He would wish that which he expresses here & the wish were possible of fulfillment, if that what he wished were possible & thus the wish would be valid. "I would wish, were the thing allowable, possible, or proper." Hodge. He does not express his wish directly, "sperantur"; for a Christian keeps himself with his wishes & prayers within the realm of possibility, within the bounds drawn by God. But that is the earnest thought of his heart, that, in case it would be possible, he would be prepared on his part to purchase the deliverance of his brethren with his own life, with his own salvation. And thereby he indeed proves an unbelievable strength, depth, & ardor of love to his people, which far surpasses the usual measure of sympathy. Bengel: Non capis huc animam non vultis propter. Et membra amoris in Moyses et Paulo non facile est existimare. Eum enim modulum ratiocinationum nostrarum

316.
9/1-13.
(1-5)

non capiti: sicut herorum bellieorum animae non capiti: parvulus. Like Paul here, Moses had expressed an
similar wish, when he stood before God on Sinai at the time of the giving of the Law. He said to God:

"Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin —; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast
written." Exod. 32, 32. When Moses spoke thus, he was in the good confidence that God would forgive this
people, in whom there were already signs of repentance to be noted. I did not consider that this thing
would really happen, for which he asked God, to strike his name out of the Book of Life. These latter
words were a strong warning of his petition, & an expression of his holy, impetuous urgency of love. In the
first sentence of the new section the new theme, which now should be amplified is carried forth very
significantly. The Epistle would now speak of Israel & the covenant which had befallen Israel. After he
had concluded his real presentation of doctrine, he follows with an amplification of historical content.

And now in vv. 5 the Epistle enumerates the prerogatives of his brethren according to the flesh,
which make it conceivable why he loves them so ardently & why he so deeply deplores their exclusion from
the salvation in Christ. They are Israelites, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς. Israel was the name of honor
of Jacob; Gen. 32, 29, and Israelite was the name of honor of the Jews. To the Israelites belonged the adop-
tion, ἡ υἱοθεσία. Israel was God's son. Hos. 11, 1: "Kinde, I call him son," Exod. 4, 22, 23: "God's peculiar
treasure" above all people, Exod. 19, 5. This υἱοθεσία refers to the people as a whole & their position
over against God as God's people, & it is to be considered well, what Hodge remarks: "As Paul is speaking
here of the external or natural Israel, the adoption or sonship which pertained to them, as such, must be external
also, in every respect. Sonship which he had spoken of in the preceding chapter. They were the υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, i.e.
the objects of His peculiar love, selected from the nations of the earth to be the recipients of His peculiar blessing, &
to stand in a peculiar relation to God." To Israel belonged ἡ ἐκλεκσις, ἡ ἐκλογή, "the election," the
story, which went before the people during the Exodus from Egypt & during their wandering in the wilderness
in the pillar of cloud & of fire, & their settling in the land of Canaan in the Holy of Holies of the Tabernacle later in the
Temple, or the gracious presence of God among His people. God dwelt in the midst of His people. This pre-
rogative, that Israel was God's people & God was their God, was already guaranteed to them by the coven-
ant, αἱ διαθήκαι, which God had entered into with the fathers of Israel. God had already concluded a form
of bond with the patriarchs, & certainly repeatedly, & had firmly promised them & their descendants that He
would be their God. Israel had the giving of the Law; the Law externally revealed from Sinai in the actual
ed. Law they had the correct form of the will of God, while the Gentiles in the remnants of the natural Law
possessed only an imperfect knowledge of the divine will. Israel had the worship of God, καὶ τὸ ἵερὸν
ἔργον. They prayed to the true living God & served Him just as He would have it. God Himself had prescribed the
correct worship to Israel. Israel belonged to the promises which aimed at Christ & the salvation in Christ. "This is
the actual prerogative of this unique nationality. And if other nations are proud of their men from whom they
stem or who have come forth from them, then to this people belong those to whom the Church of God looks

318.
9, 1-13.
(1-5)

stands at the head of the sentence. Where the εὐλογητός is, bound behind the subject, there it is not an invocation, a glorification of God, but an affirmation and, when it stands alone, is used attributively. Thus in 1, 25: τὸν ἡγούμενον, ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητός... εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἡμεῖς. 11 Cor. 11:31: ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ - ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. And thus in our passage ὁ θεὸς, ὁ ὢν ἐνὶ τῶντων θεός, εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμὴν, who is blessed forever. Summary: Nothing is more grammatically certain than the combination of the words ὁ ὢν ἐνὶ τῶντων θεός, etc. with ε. 19:12: ὁ. The contrary meaning rests not on linguistic grounds, but on dogmatical prejudice. The real motive is unbelief, which takes offense in this frank, direct testimony, concerning the divinity of Christ. What has an effect with Meyer is the consideration that Paul, although Christ appears to him as the Son of God in the metaphysical sense, still has never used the expression θεός, concerning God, that "there is the entire N. T. goes the fine line of demarcation between the Father & the Son, that while the divine essence & glory of the latter is praised with the highest possible predicates in manifold ways, not only the former, to whom the Son is completely subordinated, is really called God." But that is a Christology that is contrary to Scripture. If Christ is the Son of God, then He is also God concerning nature, essentially God, or the name Son of God is a titulus sine re. In numerous passages the Scriptures ascribe divine names, divine attributes, divine works to Christ & thus describe Him as true God. According to the Scriptures we must recognize Christ as God, even if this name were never used concerning Him. But now the Scriptures also often enough call Christ God directly & expressly. Thus already the O. T., e. g. Isa. 9:1, 10; 45:2, 5; Jer. 23:6; Ps. 45, 7. In numerous messianic prophecies the Messiah is designated as the Lord Jehovah, who comes to His people & makes His habitation with them. The N. T. passages, in which Christ is called θεός, like John 1:1; 20:28; 1 John 5:20; 1 Pet. 1:1; Luke 1:10; 9:48; Acts 2:33; Titus 1:1, 2; 1 Tim. 2:16; Tit. 2:13, are clear & incontestable. That the Synoptics, & so also Paul, likewise usually designated Christ as the Son of God, comes from the fact that they picture & present Christ to their readers as the Mediator of salvation, as the Mediator between God & man, who reconciled men to God, & has merited the righteousness which awaits before God & has made us into children of God & heirs of His glory, & therefore they must differentiate between Christ & God, between the Son & the Father. It is as good as generally recognized that Christ is called θεός in our passage as well as in others. Many expositors, however, would thereby have to differentiate between θεός and ὁ θεός, and lay weight upon the fact that Paul has not written ὁ θεός ἐνὶ τῶντων θεός. This latter title belongs only to God the Father. Nevertheless this simulation is not so much as certainly as ὁ θεός in the N. T. is variously used as a designation of God the Father in differentiation to Christ, as certainly is ὁ θεός also often a general appellation of God, except when a definite person of the Trinity is meant, except when there is a relation on the difference of the three Persons in God. And in both meanings the plain θεός is bound up with ὁ θεός. One might compare only as an example Rom. 1:25: 17; 5:21; 8:7, 9, where God the Father

is designated with θεός; further 1:9-22; 3:1-5, where ο θεός, relatively θεός, designates God in general.

It has a certain relation with the nouns ἁγίος, and ἡγίος, that it is used with & without the article in the same sense. And therefore Christ is then also called not only θεός, but also ο θεός. We read in Luke 1, 1: ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ κάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ; John 20, 28: ὁ θεός μου; Acts 2, 28: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ; 1 Tim. 2, 16: πρὸς τὸν Θεόν; 2 Tim. 1, 1: ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Even as 1 Pet. 1, 1: ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. The mystery of the Trinity is revealed, instead of the old "tritheism" is affirmed & in general the concept of God is corrected, when one subordinates the Son, as well as the Holy Spirit, as θεός, in any manner to ο θεός, to God the Father. There is only one God, & this God is really God in the fulsense of the word, & according to the Scripture we Christians confess as concerning the Father as also concerning the Son, that there is one true God, but now what concerns especially the expression ο Θεός, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, as it is completely clear that there is only one "God over all", who has nothing nor any one over Him, one θεός καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, 1 Cor. 8, 6; 12, 5; 13, 13, one Almighty, as the Symbolum Quicunque teaches. And that is the Son just as well as the Father, that Paul has not written ο Θεός ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, comes from the fact that ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ θεός stands in the predicate & that according to the connection here, as, for example, also in John 1, 1, it should be corrected, not that there is this subject, but

what it is, that Christ, who according to the human nature descended from David, is on the other side God by nature, is according to the essence God over all. According to the acts it is entirely the same when in Tit. 2, 13 Paul calls Christ the great God. For the act τίς τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χρῆςτος in two cases on a subject that Jesus Christ is, here designated as ὁ μέγας Θεός, comes, not only out of the arbitrary placing of the article, but above all, as Bomer has evidently proven, from the expression ὁ μέγας Θεός in 1, 4, which "points to the Son very decidedly as the predicate of God, as where πρὸς τὸν Θεόν in the people are regarded." That is the position of the Christians to Christ, that they acknowledge Christ as their Saviour & Redeemer, but also as their God & Lord, & saying what Paul says: Christ is God over all, blessed forever. Amen. Yes, only then, when Christ is God, completely, fully God the highest God, only then is He also our Saviour, only then is Christ's blood & righteousness a sufficient protection against the wrath of the Almighty. We conclude the discussion on Rom. 7, 5 with the words of Othmenius: "Εὐνοία λαμπρότατα Θεοῦ τὸν Χρῆστον ὀνομάσει. ὁ ἀπόστολος. α. 61. ὁ ὁ γὰρ. τριῶν Θεῶν. Ἰησοῦς ἀποστόλος παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. ὁ ὁ Θεός. τὸν Χρῆστον Θεόν ἀποκαλεῖται. And with the words of Lange: "omnes latere debemus, quod in hac solemnibus descriptione Christus tam aperte Deum appellatur. "Εὐνοία, ἡ. ὁ. benedictus. Hoc epistola subribitur omni divinis laudibus.

The high prerogatives of Israel enumerated here, which permit themselves to be composed into the two old points, that Israel is God's people & that Christ has come out of Israel declare loudly & clearly that the heart of the Synagogue is inflamed over against him & them according to the flesh & that he is heavily sorrowed over the fact that they are cut off from Christ & therefore he under the ban & curse of God.

evidently, a general truth, which also concerns the Gentiles, that the children of promise are the children of God. Gal. 4:28. From the amplification of Paul in v. 1:5, it is presented itself that he has spoken of *positivis*, when he mentions the fact that his brethren according to the flesh are accursed from Christ. That applies only to the majority of the Israelites, of the unbelieving Jewish people, who have entered into opposition to Christ & to the Church of Christ.

In the commentaries on the explanation of the passage, 9, 2-7, there is found much obscurity concerning the concepts of Israel, seed of Abraham, in the differentiation between seed & the real seed. In conformity with the presentation of the Epistle we must separate & differentiate in the following manner. The nation of Israel, all physical descendants of Abraham from Isaac, as from Jacob, was as a nation, as a nation as a whole, the people of God. God had placed even this nation in a special relationship to Himself. He had revealed Himself to this people & dwelt in their midst. This nation, Israel, had the Law. The entire nationality, the entire commonwealth of Israel was established in the Law. To this nation, Israel, belonged the promise. To Israel alone, no other nation, was the promise given, the future Christ would be revealed in the promise. Out of Israel in the fulness of time Christ has come forth. Salvation has come from the Jews. He pointed, when one restricts the prerogatives of Israel mentioned in v. 1:5 to the believing, devout Israelites. These are rather characteristics of this nation, of the whole of Israel. From Israel according to the flesh, which includes all the physical descendants of Abraham Isaac & Jacob, the Israel according to the spirit is really to be differentiated. Only the Israel which is begotten through the Word out of the spirit is the Israel of the right nature, of which the discussion is in v. 6:9. Only the believing Israelites appear before God as real children of Abraham & true children of God and have a share & an enjoyment in the salvation in Christ, while all those Israelites who are Israelites only in a general manner, not also according to the spirit & faith, are accursed from Christ. He pointed, when one envisions the salvation in Christ, the right term is which awaits before God, the eternal salvation to be established in any respect in the prerogatives of Israel enumerated in v. 1:5. The promise applies to all Israelites, in as far as the promised Christ should take & has taken flesh & blood from Israel & in as far as the salvation is offered to all Israelites in the promise & also in the preaching of the Gospel. The real children of the promise, however, are only those Israelites in whose hearts the promise also remains, who have appropriated to themselves in faith the promise & thereby also the salvation in Christ.

V. 10-13.

A second biblical example is introduced with the words: οὐ μόνον ὁ ἐὼς καὶ ῥεβέκκα ἐξ εὐὸς κοίτης. Ἐχούον ἰσάκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. v. 10. With οὐ μόνον ὁ ἐὼς καὶ ῥεβέκκα, "nicht allein aber auch, sondern auch." ("And not only this, but"), the Apostle proceeds from Abraham, who had two sons, of whom only the one should appear as his son, to Rebecca, the mother of two sons. With Philippi, Hofmann, Luthardt

324.
9, 1-3.
(13, 13)

over him, considered Jacob's seed, not Isaac's, the nation which stemmed from Jacob, was the moral to whom the prerogative came that are mentioned in v. 1-3. Jacob's people Israel, was Jacob's people, heirs (heirs) of the promise, upon this prerogative came already the blessing of the birthborn, which God gave to Jacob, & not to Isaac.

But now three significant modifiers are placed before the main clause ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ etc. The first reads: *ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ* (sup. *ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ*), "some-
times sic noch geboren waren oder etwas davor oder dachselte (beklimmen) gethan haben" ("for the
children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil"). The latter expression designates in
general the moral conduct. The *ὡς ἔστιν*, like *ὡς ἔστι*, denies subjectively, from the standpoint of the subject,
which is God. In that the Lord said to Rebecca: "The elder shall serve the younger," He did not regard the
birth, the natural form: *γενεή*, or the conduct of her two sons. The second modifier forms the purpose clause:
ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ τῷ ἰσραὴλ (sup. *ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ*). It is, indeed, when Philippi, Meyer, Weiss & others place the
declaration of purpose, the *ἵνα*, on the same degree with the *ὡς ἔστιν* in v. 3 and kind in these words a mean-
ing of "allegorismenon": thereby understand under the *ἐνδοξῇ* mentioned here the election's messianic
salvation, to eternal life. The purpose clause much rather characterizes, like the preceding modifiers, the state-
ment of God, which Rebecca said to Isaac: "The elder shall serve the younger."
whereby the purpose of God in conformity with the election would remain, would have support, that is, would
be fulfilled eternally. The *ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ* is the opposite of the *ἐνδοξῇ* in v. 3. In the voluntary historical call of
Jacob, which was announced to Rebecca that with temporal purpose of God came *ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ*
ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ (sup. *ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ*), which would say: in service of God, "which God's purity, from His God and God
there" (Hofmann), the purpose in conformity with the election, the purpose in conformity with the choice"
(Meyer), *ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ* (Hofmann, *ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ*), in this sense being already
God had made the *ἵνα ἡ καρτὶς ἐνδοξῇ* a fact it would be considered, born means: would reveal to him with his name,
salvation, & election, which out of Isaac would come forth the nation of the world. And this purpose
had the form of equality of an election, in fact, God chose, is Himself the younger of the two sons of the elder or the
good mentioned. According to this purpose, which was in conformity with the election, God had been
announced to the elder that Jacob, not Isaac, would be the brother of the nation of God and hence trans-
mit the inheritance of Abraham's estate, the promise, & thus continually had Isaac Jacob & Jacob's seed into
that which they should be according to the eternal determination. The following words: *ὡς ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ*, *ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ*, we do not have as an explanation to the purpose clause, which purpose is a
qualifying construction & connection of thought, but this latter, the name of the nation of God, *ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ*,
ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, is the two occurring words, which are the same as the words *ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ*. The *ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ* is the
younger, "for not regarded as a child of Isaac, not on that of the elder's conduct or the younger, but
as a result of the free calling, it is the nation of God, who called Jacob & Isaac & Jacob's seed."

become & has become. The call of Jacob is now out in the words which God spoke to Rebecca & which were then made known to Jacob. These words are, as it were, the installation of Jacob into the office of patriarch. And there applies here what we remarked above concerning the relationship of election & calling. The calling of Jacob was a result, clear realization of his eternal election. In the calling the election reflects itself. And as also already from the election of Jacob, as well as from his calling, was every consideration of works, merit, & conduct excluded.

In v. 12 the Apostle still adds a word of Scripture taken from the Prophet Malachi, which confirms the revelation which Rebecca received. When it reads in Mal. 1, 2, 3: "Jakob habe ich geliebt, Esau aber gehasst" ("I have loved Jacob, but Esau I have hated"), then there is nothing else meant than that the special love which God turned toward Jacob, in that He made him into the forefather of the people of God & into the heir & bearer of the promise, remained denied to Esau. "Hassen" is, of course, otherwise in Scripture in the sense of "nicht lieben"; e.g., Gen. 27, 41; Mal. 1, 2, 3; Luke 14, 26. The precedence of Jacob before Esau is comprehended in Mal. 1, 5 in the words: "Herr ist Jehova über Israels Vengeance" ("The Lord will be magnified from the border of Israel"). That means: "Jehovah proves Himself great over the land of Israel." Keil. That was the prerogative of Jacob & his seed, that the true, living God, the Lord Jehovah, revealed Himself to them & manifested His greatness to them, accepted.

(This people as His people, wonderfully guided & guarded them, & entrusted them with His Word, Law & promise.

The historically salutary call of Jacob & his seed is, as we have seen, the content of this decree of God which Rebecca received, the content & goal of the election & calling of Jacob, & it does not deal of the historical destiny of the two sons of Rebecca and their descendants, not of salvation & condemnation. We gladly agree with Luther, that Ishmael, as well as Esau, was finally also saved. Both had taken out of the parental home the correct knowledge of God & knew also the promise, which Isaac & Jacob had received. The account of the reconciliation of Esau with Jacob very much gives the impression that Esau now also occupied the correct position over against God & bowed himself under the will of God, who had turned the blessing of the first-born to Jacob. We also accept it that even many of the descendants of Ishmael & Esau, among whom first of all reminders of the divine revelation had maintained themselves, were saved by the grace of God, the gratia vaga, as Luther called it. But evidently the Apostle would have this second biblical example, like the first, applied to the impending question. It is to him like the first, an $\alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\gamma\alpha\ \gamma\omicron\psi\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$. Except that he here leaves the meaning & application to the reader, how it presents the same of itself. That Esau was excluded

from the line of promise, points to the fact that not all Israelites who according to the flesh stem from Abraham are Israelites of the right kind. And Jacob, like Isaac, is a type of the true children of Abraham & the children of God, the $\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, v. 8. From the example of Jacob one should learn: All those Israelites who, similar to Jacob, are chosen & called by God without any regard for their birth and ancestry, without any regard for their works or conduct, but according to the free purpose of God, but who

five times, that the Lord hardened his heart: Exod. ~~7~~ 10, 11, 20, 21; 11, 10; 14, 7. The hardening of pharaoh disappears accordingly as the divine reaction rose against the human conduct, as the adequate punishment of self-hardening. This contrary to Scripture & basically at laughing, when one deduces the hardening out of a decretum absolutum reprobationis, which excludes the rejected ones from eternity from the love of God, the redemption of Christ, & the grace of the Holy Spirit. We prove in the example of Pharaoh still further, how the self-obduracy & the hardening takes place also in those who finally harden themselves & as punishment for that are hardened by God, God has previously left no stone unturned & nothing undone, in order to make them willing for conversion. When God thus Moses & Aaron summoned Pharaoh to let Israel go, & confirmed His word with signs & wonders, it was His earnest intention that Pharaoh should obey His command. Then when the signs of God became every plague for the king & for the entire land of the Egyptians, God wanted to imbue him with a salutary fear, so that he might learn to know Him, the true, living God, & give Him honor. And in that too, as often as Pharaoh gave in only a little, & ended the punishment & immediately took away the plagues again, He wanted to soften the heart of Pharaoh by such mildness & move him to release the children of Israel from their servitude & thereby to spare himself. Where Luther in his writing de servo arbitrio comes to speak of Pharaoh & the obduracy of Pharaoh, he remarks: What I ask you, had God left undone, in order to bring Pharaoh to repentance, to chastize, to call him

1. How can there be a greater mildness & goodness than when God so easily took away the plagues and forgave him his sins so often, so often showed him good again, so often took away the evil? St. Louis Edict. 1707, 1708, 1709. Yes, God has no desire in the death of the sinner but that he should be converted & live. God permits his word to be preached to the godless, admonishes, chastises, invites, & asks them, so that they are converted & learn obedience. He would lead them to repentance by His earnestness & by His goodness. But now what did St. Paul do? One time after another he hardened his heart against God's word & works, & willfully suppressed all the impressions which the plagues of God & the proofs of the efficacy of God made upon him. In that consists the wilful obduracy of the sinner, that he despises God's earnestness & goodness, shakes off of himself all the impressions of the divine Word, & continually resists the Holy Spirit of God, who attests Himself in his heart & conscience & would earnestly convert him. But the great God, to whom it is as full earnest with His commands & orders, as with His saving grace, does not oppose Himself for a long duration, so that man resists His Word & will, & also His good & gracious will, knowing the conversion he has converted, & he hardens those who have hardened themselves. That would not say that he works & nourishes the perverted hardened mind in them. God never works evil. Certainly also among the wicked dealing of men the conscious divine generals never, fails.

But it applies even there: Deus concurrens ad materiale, non ad, formale. God hardens the incorrigible sinners first of all permissive. He gives them opportunity: freedom, so that their wickedness can carry itself out unhindered even to the last better fruit. With that is connected a second & a third point. God hardens de-
structive or ἐγκαταλείπει, and παρέρχεται, God ceases to work in man, withdraws from him His Spirit, spiritum suum subtrahit (Luther) and thus with the possibility of conversion & improvement, &

332.
9/14-18.

gives man over to his perverted, hardened mind & will & into the power of Satan, so that he can carry out his work in him undisturbed. Deus relinquit iniquos in manu sua. Thus God permitted Pharaoh to continue in his wickedness, even to the utmost, so that he not only held them firmly, but also set out others them, when they had departed contrary to his will. God also hardens occasionally. That comes out especially significant in the example of Pharaoh. Even after all his pains to change his mind had proven themselves in vain, God still continued to speak to him thru Moses & Aaron, permitted him to see still greater wonders, rendered His plagues more severe, & thus gave him occasion & opportunity for further defiance & resistance. God continually holds His Word & work before the eyes of the hardened sinner & that now becomes, or him as a favor of death unto death. In all that however, there still is its far righteous & terrible judgment of God. God hardens those judicially, who have already spoken the judgment upon themselves.

Fathers describe the hardening of Pharaoh in the following manner: Thus God hardened Pharaoh, in that He held out to the gods & evil will of the same a word & work which he hated, namely, out of an inborn, and a natural corruption. And when God did not change him inwardly thru the Spirit much, rather continued to offer & to urge upon him His words & works, but Pharaoh looked upon his powers, riches and might according to the same natural fault & thrust them in, then it happened that he became arrogant & proud thru the imagination of his things on the one hand, & on the other hand thru the humility of Moses; & because the Word of God came to him under a disdainful form, he became a proud defier, and in this manner became hardened; then, when he became more & more aroused & hardened Moses the more continued & threatened. H. Louis Esch, XVIII, 1888. The Formator of Concord illustrates the example of Pharaoh with the following words: "Accordingly, even Pharaoh (of whom it is written, Exod. 7:16; Rom. 9:17) in my judgment for this cause have I raised thee up, for to show in thee my power, & that my name may be declared throughout all the earth, perished not because God had regarded him as a sinner or because it had been His good pleasure that he should be damned & lost. For God is not willing that any should perish in Rom. 9:29. He also has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way & live. Ezek. 33:11. But that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, namely, that Pharaoh always turned again & again & became the more obstinate, the more he was admonished, that was a punishment of his obstinate & his terrible tyranny, which in many & manifold ways he practised inhumanly & against the accusation of his heart towards the children of Israel. And since God caused His Word to be preached & His will to be proclaimed to him, & Pharaoh nevertheless wilfully reared up straightway against all admonitions & warnings, God withdrew His hand from him, & thus his heart became hardened & obstinate, and God executed His judgment upon him, for he was guilty of nothing else than that he according to his will & appetite also introduced, the example of Pharaoh, as no other reason than to prove by it the justice of God which He exercises towards the iniquitous & despisers of His Word; by means of which, however, has He intended & intended to lead it to mean that as a rejected salvation to him & any person, but that God claims him to eternal damnation. The secret counsel that we should not be such, or that it should not be possible for him, to be saved."

(Aug., p. 159.) Koerner remarks on Rom. 9, 18: *Si dicitur indurari, qui destitutus Spiritu Domini relinquitur sibi et latroni; talis enim suo scelus impetus et ruit in exitum. Deus ergo indurat, quando rebelles et contumaces deservit, avertit se ab illis ad poenam, ut, poenitent sua culpa et iusto huius iudicio.*

I therefore thus with the divine mercy & with the hardening, which God inflicts, it does not have the same condition with reference to the motive. When God has mercy on anyone, calls & converts a sinner & in this manner saves & blesses him, then that in no way lies in the willing & pains of the man, in man's conduct but has its foundation alone in God, in God's grace & mercy, already in His eternal grace. The Scriptures attest that. That is therefore God's way, that He is gracious because He is gracious. And God is righteous in His action, even when it does not correspond to the weak human concept of righteousness. When, on the other hand, God hardens & finally condemns anyone, then the reason for that lies in man alone, in the conduct of man, in his self-obduracy. Obduracy, which has eternal condemnation as a result, is a well-deserved, righteous judgment of God, whose righteousness is also very evident to the godless, who are affected by it. This doubt is, as we hold firm according to the Scriptures still, but the by popular mind all difficulties & objections are not removed by that. When we compare the two statements, the one concerning the divine mercy & the one concerning of duracy, as Paul does in our text, when we compare with one another the objects of mercy & the objects of obduracy, then we cannot understand why the two, who are both sinful and

condemned alike by nature, God has mercy on one & hardens the other, gives the one over to self-deserved obduracy, while He converts the other, who conducts himself no better, why God permits the one to continue resist even to the uttermost, while with the other He takes it away before it comes to self-obduracy & hardening. And since in the calling & conversion the eternal election of God is reflected, therefore the question: *Why is the one elected before the other?* includes in itself also the other question: *Why is the one elected before the other?* And now the Apostle, does not solve this difficulty here, does not justify God before the human reason, but simply points to the will of God. He quotes the double 31 & 32 in 9, 18. See the meaning. That is here the ultimate ratio: God has mercy on whom He will & hardens whom He will. He has shown His mercy to Moses, but to Pharaoh, on the other hand, His power, because He willed it so. With that one should at it rest satisfied and as crisis knows believe that the will of God is always holy, good, & just. That God converts whom He will and hardens whom He will, belongs to the in discernible ways of the grace & the incomprehensible judgments of God, of which Paul speaks at the core of this section, 11 & 33, which we cannot grasp & should not search into. Certainly, God has His wise & just motive for this. But God has hidden that, from us, but we shall know it at one time, in the light of eternity. In this case it might still be stressed that Paul knows of no secret, absolute decree of rejection of God.

What we say concerning the will of God in our passage, & certainly as far as He enters into the hardening, includes in itself no such decree & does not exclude the general gracious will of God. Even if those who are finally hardened & rejected, as already has been remarked several times, that God does not will the death of the sinner. God has also offered them His grace, He would earnestly convert & save them. But they have not wanted to. And now God permits that to happen what they will & He finally gives them over to their perverted will. Nevertheless thus & per-

miraculous, not involve any weakness in God, does not happen without the will of God, without which nothing takes place on earth; which is always wise & just as tho we cannot always understand it. It rests upon a SEIN IN DEO, when God nevertheless permits, suffers, allows to continue the evil, which He neither wills nor loves, but much rather hates, which He in no wise works or causes.

On the basis of Rom. 9. 1-23 and similar passages, Luther in his book *de servo arbitrio* speaks of the hidden will or the majesty will of God. What he says of that I think of it is included in short in the following passage: "It is enough that we only know this, that there is in God a certain incomprehensible will, but what, why, & how far He wills that is absolutely not granted us to ask, to want to know, to trouble ourselves about it or to occupy ourselves with it, but only to pray with ears trembling. Therefore you speak correctly: If God does not will death, then to be sure it is ascribed to our own will, when we are lost. Right, I say, if you should speak of the preaching God, for He wills that all men should be saved, because He comes to us with the Word of salvation, it is the guilt of the will, when it does not permit Him, as it reads in Matt. 23. 37: 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, ... and ye would not!' But why the divine majesty does not take away this guilt of our will or does not change it in all men, since it does not stand in the power of men, or why God accounts this to him, since man cannot be without the same, that one cannot search out, & even if you would investigate it as an idea, you will never find it, as Paul says in Rom. 9. 20: 'Who art thou that resistest against God?' *Ep. Louis Beth.* Aug., 1775. 1776. The Lutheran Concordia, in its *Formula Concordae*, accounts to the mysteries, which God has reserved to His wisdom & which we are should not search into, also this: "Similarly one is hardened & blinded, given over to a perverted mind, another in the guilt, in a conscience, etc. *M. Luther. Op. m. B. P. 715.*"

The same originates in Rom. 9. 1 & is found in the commentaries of *Augustine* & *Bernard* on the *Epistles to the Romans*. *Boetius* writes: *Non autem Paulus exponebat explicat causam, quare Deus non multos recipiat, multos vero rejiciat; hoc enim ad mysteria et arcana Dei consilia pertinet, quod nos in hoc caligine velis et judicii. Cuius non possumus. Unde dicitur: Explicatus igitur in commendanda discrimine inter Nebuchodonosorem et Elharconem, dixerunt, illud dixerunt, dices inter ipsos iacere, quod alter crediderit, alter non crediderit. Quia etiam discrimen est inter Petram et Judam & Barionem, ac inter duos latrones cum Christo crucifixos, quod Petrus et alter latro conversi crediderint, Judas autem et alter latro avari desperaverint. Item discrimen, acit Paulus inter gentes et Judaeos. Quid igitur dicemus, inquirimus? Quod gentes quae non sectabantur justitiam apprehenderunt justitiam, justitiam autem eam, quae est ex fide, Israel vero qui sectabatur agere justitiae, ad legem justitiae non pervenit. Propter quid? Quia non ex fide, sed tanquam ex operibus legis. Item discrimen, facit Christus in universo humano genere. Qui crediderit in Christum Dei non condemnatur. Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit. Qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur. Si autem, progressus, inter et dixeris: Pater dorum Dei est, non hominis industria. Caro et sanguis, inquit, Christus ad eternum, non revelabit tibi, sed pater meus, qui est in coelis.*

Quid est igitur, quod Deus conferat clementer et misericorditer donum, sicut Jacobo et non Esau, (Danieli et non Sauli, Petro et non Iudas, alteri latroni et non alteri, Paulo et non Caiphae, Gentibus et non Iudaeis, cum eadem sit peccati massa et omnes declinaverint, nec est, qui faciat bonum, ne unus quidem? Haec quaestio pertinet in catalogum eorum, quae saepe numero solent torquari impiis, quam a piis morari, videlicet: Cur Deus permittit, ut Adam ceciderit in peccatum, et non praeservavit eum a peccato? Cur non extinto primo Adam et in peccatum lapso creavit alium, ex quo omnes homines justis essent nati? Cur, cum ipse fuerit ab aeterno, non condidit mundum citius, quam condidit? Cur prosuit mundum hic et non alibi? Et infinita alia. Quid ergo dicendum? Siquidem tu, qui haec quaeris, impius fueris, respondet tibi Paulus: Et homo, inquit, qui es tu, qui ex adverso responderis Deo? Et Christus ipse, sicut paulo ante commemoratum est: An non licet michi in rebus meis lacere, quod volo? An oculus tuus malus est, quia ego bonus sum? Si autem fueris pius, jubet te Paulus secum exclamare: O profunditatem divitiarum et sapientiae et cognitionis Dei, quam inscrutabilia sunt iudicia eius et investigabiles vias eius.

The mystery of the discretio personarum is a standing truth of the Lutheran orthodoxy of the 16. century in contrast to the hypergists & their causa discriminis in homine. We still find here several testimonies of the best known theologians of that time, which lead to place into the light the sense of the Scripture word in Rom. 9, 11, 15 and the parallel passages, Rom. 7, 20 and Rom. 11, 32. Cf. "Schreund Welure," 1880, p. 266 ff.; 1881, p. 334 ff.

In the Strassburg Formula of Concord subscribed by Jacob Andreae, from the year 1553, it reads: "But that this grace or this gift of faith is not given to all by God, when He calls all to Himself and certainly according to His unending goodness earnestly calls: 'Come to the marriage, for all things are now ready,' is a hidden mystery, known to God alone, possible of investigation by no human reasoning, to be considered & investigated with fear; as it is written: 'The depths of the riches either the wisdom or knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, & His ways past finding out!' Rom. 11, 33. And Christ gives thanks to His Father, because He had hidden such things of His will & secret, & had revealed them unto His saints." Matt. 13, 35. Nevertheless troubled consciences should not stumble on this hidden manner of the divine will, but look to the will of God revealed in Christ, who calls all sinners to Himself. But also it is therefore not to be said of God that He wants sin, when He does not hinder the will & the way of a sinner, but permits that they continue in sin; for in truth God hates sin, whose originator is the devil, who has not continued in the truth. For God is terribly angry against sin, forbids the same & threatens with His wrath all the transgressors of His Law. Ps. 5. God's goodness, however, is of the kind that He can use the evil which He permits for the honor of His name; as it is written: 'Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, & that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.' Rom. 9, 17 & 18. 'That happens when God punishes sin with sin.' Victoria, notum by V. E. Loewen, II, 257.

336.
7/4-13.

In the "Chronologie der Concordienformel" (Breslau, 1584, p. 236 ff.), written by Chemnitz, de-
voted to Kirchner, we read: "The Christian Book of Concord also does not deny that there is a reject-
ion in God & that God should not reject some; thus it does not go against Luther's statement, when in sermo
arbitrio he writes against Erasmus, that this is the highest degree of faith to believe that God is never the-
less the most benevolent, who saves no Jew. But therein it sees that it does not assign God as the real origin-
ator of such rejection & condemnation, goes to the opposite teaching; & that, when it comes to its disputation,
all men should lay their finger upon the mouth & earnestly say with the Apostle Paul in Rom. 11: Propter inre-
ditabilem fratris suum; and in Rom. 9: 'The wages of sin is death.' To the others, however, when the question
is asked, Why God the Lord does not convert & make believers etc. of all men (which He still really could) —
then His Holy Spirit, we should further speak with the Apostle: Quam incomprehensibilis sunt judicium eius
et incommensurabilis vias eius! but never attribute to God the Lord Himself the willing & effective cause of
the rejection & condemnation of the impenitent. But they were ignorant & say: Because you in our land in
election or the end, therefore you must also understand the other point, namely, that in God Himself is the
cause of the rejection, from eternity, and cause of impenitence. Now we say, that we were not considering the
matter in any way to make God into the originator of the rejection, which really does not stand in God
but in the sin, & to really attribute to Him the cause of condemnation; but we would remain with the
statement of the Prophet Hosea, chap. 1, verse 2, where God is said: 'I saw, the whorl & conceived thyself; but in me
is thy self.' We would not, as heard above from Luther, inquire of the dear God, inasmuch as He is hidden
& has not manifested Himself. For it is too high for us & we cannot grasp it; the more we enter into this
case, the farther we come from the dear God & doubt the more His gracious will over against us. Thus also
the Book of Concord is not in dispute, that God does not work in all men in a similar manner; for there
are many in all times whom He has not called through the public preaching office; but that we should there-
fore conclude with the opposite that He is a real cause of the rejection of such people, & that He has
decided for Himself out of simple compass that He would reject them & eternally repudiate them, also
outside of sin, they shall never persuade us. For it is enough that we, when we come to the depths of the
mysteries of God, speak with the Apostle in Rom. 11: 'His judgments are unsearchable, & in! Cor. 15:
'Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.' What there is in that our Redeemer
Christ Himself shall remain to us in eternal life."

Chemnitz writes: "How could then come that Judas is not forgiven, that he did not receive the forgiveness
of sin, when he repented of what he had done? And who was lacking in his repentance & penitence, that
he could receive grace? He had no doubt in that he did not believe that God is gracious & forgiving;
that did him the harm, for where there is no faith, there is also no place of God's forgiveness. And now
our Catechism says in the third Article of our Christian faith that man cannot by his own reason or strength
believe in Jesus Christ or come to Him, but that God should first bring him to such faith; for faith is a gift of

God; how does it come then, that God did not give such faith into the heart of Judas, that he also could have

(believed, that he could ~~also have believed~~ be helped thru Christ? There we must return with our question & say in Rom. 11: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom & knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, & his ways past finding out!" We can & should not investigate this & sink ourselves too deeply in such thoughts, but use this thus, that we do not give ourselves intentionally into sin & tempt God, so that God does not draw His hand away from us & let us sink; for where that happens, we fall out of one sin into another, & gradually slip & deeply into sin, that afterwards there is no return, & we cannot again come to stand. As it has happened with Judas." *Passions & predilections. Th. II, p. 17 ff.*

Timotheus Kirchner: "How does it come about that few are chosen, as Christ says in Matt. 22? Answer: We speak here, from the revealed word, which speaks in Rom. 11: 'Because of unbelief they were broken off.' Therefore it is significantly shown, that unbelief is the guilt. — Then is God the cause that some are condemned? Answer: In no way; for He swears & speaks Himself, that He does not desire the death of the sinner, but that he be converted & live, Ezek. 18. Therefore we should not say that the rejection of the godless is God's own ordinance: 'for the wages of sin is death' Rom. 6. But couldn't He convert them all with one another? Answer: There there is no doubt; if He wanted to use His omnipotence; but that He does not do it, we

do not have to talk that over with Him. Paul writes in Rom. 9: 'What if God, willing to shew his wrath, & to make his power known, endured with much long suffering those vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction? In those whom He thus permits to remain in their unbelief He shows His righteousness & His wrath against sin. He is obligated to none of us, but what He gives & does, that He does out of pure grace, for the sake of Jesus Christ; to Him we have to give thanks & to attribute everything. — Then because faith in Christ is an extraordinary gift of God, why does He not give it to all? Answer: The discussion of this question we should lay off into eternity; nevertheless let us be satisfied in the fact, that God does not will that we should search out His heavenly judgments; Rom. 11: 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom & knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments!' — But it has the appearance that God is unjust, that He does not give His knowledge & faith to all men, to Jews, Gentiles, & the impenitent. Answer: How can He be unrighteous, because He is not obligated to any man? Therefore the Apostle also speaks in Rom. 9: 'O man, who art thou that repliest against God?' It appears also that God is unjust in this, that here on earth He really permits evil to come upon the devout & more often permits it to go well with the wicked; & the reason cannot very well agree with this (the Gospel shows reasons why God lay many crosses upon His own here & lays by His glory until later); therefore it also

seems to us here, that God is unjust in that, that He does not give His Word & faith in Christ to all men, & our reason is unable to find itself in this in this life. But when we shall come thither & into that life, then we shall see & understand that God is not unrighteous, altho He really does not give the Word and faith to all men. The light of glory shall immediately dissolve this question excellently & easily; which dissolution we cannot, to be sure, see in the light of grace. God's punishments & judgments upon sin must be

338.
9/14-15

against as well as His grace. All human nature is corrupted by sin; for that reason God owes us no-
thing else than condemnations! Since He also in the meantime gives His Word of grace, we thrust
out the same & make ourselves unworthy of eternal life, as it stands in Acts 13 concerning the Jews. There-
fore no unrighteousness can be ascribed to God the Lord in this case." *Deutsches Enchiridion*, p. 172 ff.
Heinricher: "Altho God can make willing ones out of all unwilling ones, still He does not do that; &
why He does not do this He has His just & wise reasons, which are not our matter to search into. Much
rather are we obligated to give thanks from our hearts, that He has thru the preaching of the Gospel called
us to the communion of eternal life & has enlightened our minds thru faith." In *omnes* *eggs*. Pauli *eggs*.
Comment. Leipzig, 1575, fol. 213.

Johann Moerlin writes in his *conferentia de libero arbitrio*, which was directed against the hyper-
calists: "But why God has not regenerated all in like manner & kindled the light of faith in all without
difference ... is without doubt in part to be ascribed to His secret counsel, which we cannot search into,
but in part must be accepted according to God's revealed Word, that He punishes some in a just manner,
because of their iniquities even still in their descendants." "It is revealed to us, that He will save only
those who believe in Christ, & that unbelief is out of ourselves. But hidden are the judgments of God, why
He converted Paul, but did not convert Caiaphas, accepted against the fallen Peter, but surrendered (I
suspect to doubt." *Schneidewitz, Catalogus Haereticorum* II. n. 213, 223.

Ullmann Hecker comes to speak repeatedly of this mystery in his *refutation* of the grounds of
the hypercalists (*Schneidewitz*, n. 313 ff.), "why God chooses, calls, regenerates the one, & permits the other
to harden himself," "calls to himself his one & in no way does not change His will with the other," &
remarks that "God has a secret counsel, which we cannot search into, it is not subject to our
speculation."

Finally, it is still remembered that also later theologians, who already teach an election in reg-
istration of faith & thereby surpass the bounds of orthodoxy, nevertheless still acknowledge this mystery of the
divine *secretum*. Thus Gerhardus in his *Tractatus* (I, n. 335), where he speaks of the knowledge of the blessed,
proposes the following statement of Augustin: *Et si quidquid non nunc latet manifestum erit, illius ratio
manifesta erit, cur hic electus sit & ille reprobatus, cur hic in regnum assumptus & ille in servitutem
reductus, cur alius in terra moritur, alius in instantia, alius in futuro, alius in aeternitate, cur alius
pauper & alius dives etc.*

The question, why God converts the one, changes his heart, & permits that others continue in
their sin & wickedness, in their relation to us, I do not have to harden the will as yet, finally I ordered
hence, together with the other more general questions, which do not concern the case of election, questions, namely,
... why God permits some to be called, & some not to be called, & some to be saved, & some in hell
... questions of which I am not yet sure. I have looked into the *theology* of the world & there

obvious how God leads & rules the individuals & entire nations, how He works thus with one in another way with others, then we really shake our heads & cannot rhyme that with the righteousness as well as with the goodness of God, then involuntarily there come to us such questions as these: Why does God lead the one to fortune through His goodness, while we see others perishing in misery & doubt? Why does He bring the one to knowledge & reflection through error & tribulation, while He leads another with pure good fortune, which makes them secure & overconfident? Why does He interfere so apparently in the course of life with the one & lead them against their own purpose to places where they hear the Word concerning their salvation, while He permits others to go their own way? Why does He take some by an untimely death to Himself in heaven, before they have fallen from faith, while He does not prevent it in others who turn away from the truth & die in their sins? Why does He permit so many children to perish in the grace of Baptism, while He permits thousands of others to be baptized & come to love, who then soon & alas forsake that same grace again? Why does God take one place for a school & teachers, who lead many to righteousness & in others places not? Why does God permit His Word to ring forth surely & plainly in one land & in others that period, while in others lands many generations after another are not stirred by the sounds of the Gospel? This is evident for those Christians that it would be blasphemous, impudence, if one would search into these questions & seek an answer for them. Then, however, we should

solidify ourselves with the answer of the Apostle in Rom. 9, 5: "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, & whom he will he hardeneth." It is not question & search as to why God wills it thus. Ever against that does our conscience warn the theologians in the following.

19-21.

Now in v. 19 the Apostle raises an objection, which one could make against that which he had said, that not even with the words: *Τὸ οὖν ἐπορεύει*; but in that he writes: *Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐκ*, "But worst must give answer" ("then will say then unto me"); and thus imagines an opponent who opposes him. He draws out of Paul's words the conclusion: Why does He still criticize? For who can resist His will? It is evident, as Philip. 1 correctly remarks, that that is not the speech of a modest questioner, but of an insolent gamester, nevertheless, not even of a hardened Jew, but of a man who judges of himself & measures God's divine things according to his own thoughts. It is the carnal, emancipated reason which speaks & concludes thus: If that is supposed to apply that God hardens whom He will, why does He still complain & criticize? *Τὸ ἔτι μὲν ἔφηκεν*;

The *ἔτι* is to be taken logically here. God then no longer has the right to censure, to reprove, and to punish the hardened man. For who can resist His will? *Τὸ γὰρ ποῦν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἀνθρώπων πνεύματος*; *ὁ οὖν ἡμῶν* means "Will" ("will"), "Aim" ("aim, purpose, conatum"), cf. Gal. 2, 13. It corresponds to the double *ἐξουσία* in v. 15, which therefore is to be taken in the same sense. The question: Who resists? is more rigorous than: Who can resist? That this fact never comes forth is the most striking proof for its impossibility. Philip. 1.

340.
9, 19-21.

sum, caro audit, per se in eis, ut alios salvet vel ad salutem destinet, alios autem interire sinat
tumultuatur et obicit: si Dei voluntate homines indurantur, frustra ipse nobis irascitur, (non reprehendit atque etiam de nobis conqueritur. Memorem potest esse voluntate resistere aut
aliter agere, quam ipse velit. Hoerner. Schlegel & others understand the contradiction of the fact that
God has no right to censure the disobedience, which He Himself has worked. Nevertheless the respondent has
no different conception of the hardening than He does. Likewise here, where He permits the opponent to speak,
the speaker holds firmly to the correct concept of ex. 11 pp. 12-14, according to which God hardens his one who
has hardened himself, gives him over to his hardened mind & will. The natural reason appears in the following
manner: If the hardening takes place with God's will & permission, if God permits that in 5212, the
unbelief, disobedience, & sinners if he continues to sin after that, then he cannot make any more reproach
against the means. For man cannot possibly withdraw himself from that will of God, cannot desert, cannot
possibly avoid the hardening, if God does not hinder it. The opponent, nevertheless, is not interested in
interceding in the favor of the innocent & the unbeliever, it is admitted at last by right ~~means~~ censure.
justified, & condemns the unbelieving man & means by that fact that God reproves & reproaches, to be very
to prove the injustice of that which the Apostle had said concerning the divine hardening. "Hofmannus" for
that is an intolerable thought for natural man, that God has mercy on whom He will & hardens
whom He will. Aliquisque displicet qui credit, sed non habere nobiscum, nemo negavit. Prope falsum
est quod dicitur in 5212: ex. 11 pp. 12-14. The opposing argumentation according to the
Apostle's sense & tendency is self-evidently of other conclusions. The Scripture testifies clearly & significantly, &
the conscience of man bears witness, that unbelief, obduracy, which man has against the divine judg-
ment of hardening, is man's own act, his own guilt. That God by right makes man amenable, or the act
wherein he hardens himself against the voice of grace. But this fact is not altered in the slightest by the other
fact, that God hardens whom He will. For the will of God, of which it is said here, which permits, which
allows, unbelief, disobedience, obduracy to continue, lies in an entirely different sphere, which is abso-
lutely not transparent for man, belongs to the mystery of the divine majesty, with which we should
have nothing to do. The fallacy of the opposing demonstration of proof comes into view significantly when one
generalizes the same & orders in general to the case of the divine permission of the will. With the same right
one can & must decree & conclude thus. If God had permitted the fall of Adam, the fall of Satan in a
human manner, then no reproach affects man or Satan. If by God's permission the falling away?
If God intentionally endures & permits the evil to continue which takes place on earth, then He is
small & miserable, or the same. But now since all evil is evidently man's guilt, then it follows that one
must let God's will & permission entirely out of play, that God is entirely absent, remains completely
with His knowledge, will & works (conscience generalis), as often as man does evil. That is evidently
a logically perverted & blasphemous conclusion.

542.
7.17.21.

expressly, etc. 27, and 1. in the case with a vessel designated for a base use. "We are, and so it surpasses the
tertiary comparison, when one in the significance of the image takes the twofold No. 2 & 4, in (v. 20 b and v. 21, for itself alone, which in the first case is modified by 25 & 27, and indicated by the
added statement of purpose, & with Meyer & Philippi understands it concerning the "re-establish-
ment of the moral quality of man" or with Hermann & others of the creation of man, the meaning is
evidently this, that God, the Creator, has free right of disposition over His creatures. God, the Almighty
Creator, is Sovereign over against His creatures & has the right to fashion their fate as He wills it,
to make some into vessels of mercy (v. 22), others into vessels of wrath (v. 22), 2. no creature has
the right to complain in the latter case over his lot & fate. Or in other words: His Creator & Sovereign
God has the right to have mercy on whom He will & to harden whom He will, namely in the
above sufficiently presented sense. In substance the statement in v. 20 b. 21 does not surpass the state-
ments in v. 18. The fact made applicable here is here only led back to the privilege of the Creator. It con-
tradicts accordingly the tendency of the opposite & the entire connection of the discussion, when Philippi
& ancient expositors differentiate between the ius divinum and the exercitium iuris, and remark that
in this case God never makes use of His privilege. For in that God has mercy on whom He will & hardens
whom He will, He confirms His right of sovereignty. For such a determination one is cer-
tainly occasioned, if, as obliged, when one with Philippi in a false manner designates the 25 & 27
of God to the fact that God has the right to form holy men & unholy men ex eadem massa humana.

The adversary whom the Spirit prompts to speak in this section in whom the perverted human
reason is personified, should consider this well, that he pronounces the right of the sovereignty of God
with his contradictions. That is also a warning for those theologians who have gone out of bounds,
who with their small, glowing light of reason would light up & clarify all the mysteries in heaven &
on earth & boldly & unwisely deny everything that does not fit into their narrow sphere. Likewise,
however, the truth which Paul asserts in the section v. 18-21, contains a direction for the believing
Christians & especially also for the theologians who believe the foregoing. There should take note
well of the line of demarcation at which the divine revelation ceases & the mysteries of God begin.
In the scriptures it is revealed clearly & distinctly what is the exclusive cause of conversion &
salvation, namely, God's grace & mercy, & what is the exclusive cause of obduracy & condemnation,
namely, the evil will of man. This doubt, at one should enter & emphasize with all zeal, that
serves for the salvation & benefit of soul. Further the scriptures say also of that divine
passage, Rom. 9. 14-21, and in the parallel Rom. 1. 23-25, that there is an unsearchable will of God,
that there is an unsearchable divine mystery, which God in His wisdom has withheld, & that even the
divine secretarium, the causa discriminis is such a mystery. But with this Christian doctrine
& theology has arrived at its limits. At this point where mind is made like unto the heart, out of

the rich of the believing Christians & theologians themselves continually arise such questions: Why? Why does God will & do this & that? Why not the opposite? But these questions we must nip in the bud; for they kind no answer, even in God's Word & revelation & do not serve for the salvation of souls, which is the one purpose of Christian doctrine & theology. Whoever begins to search into that which is unsearchable inevitably falls into a dispute & quarrel with the great majestic God. This enough, as further remarks in the above quoted passage, that we only know this, that in God there is a certain unsearchable will, the revelation goes only so far; but why & how far He wills is not permitted us to ask & to want to know, for God has hidden that from us. The fact, the truth, which, as it were, forms the key-stone of the revealed truth, that there are insoluble & inextricable questions, that there are mysteries which far surpass our horizon & which God Himself has hidden from us in a wise purpose, should maintain us in the fear of God & in humility, to protect us against idly, perilous speculation & to urge us to remain with that which is our office, & that is, that we correctly consider & proclaim the revealed counsel of God, & certainly the entire counsel of God concerning our salvation, nothing less & nothing more.

9.22-29.

The Epistle now gives his discussion another turn, in that he continues in v. 22: *Εἰ δὲ θεῶν ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ θυμὸν αὐτοῦ ἡνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεπὴν ὀργῆς, κατ' ἡμετέρας, ὥστε εἰς ἀπώδειξιν.* "Wenn aber Gott, obgleich er sein Zorn eigen und seine Macht kundthun wollte, in grosser Geduld die Belästigung des Zornes getragen hat, die reif waren zum Verderben—" "What if God, willing to show his wrath, & to make his power known, endued with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction". That God in great patience bore the vessels of wrath is our historical fact; even as the other, that He has called us out from among Jews & Gentiles, εἰς καὶ ἐκ κτίσεως ἡμῶν, v. 21. Thus the case is displayed here, that an established fact is taken in the form of a condition, in order to deduce another fact from it. We have already found such conditional clauses in chap. 5, v. 10, 17. Paul here points emphatically to the fact that God had exercised great patience and long-suffering & certainly even so He would show His wrath & make known His power. We analyze the participle *δείξαι*: "obgleich" and not "weil". He would show His wrath. For the long-suffering of God does not appear to harmonize with His wrath. God was determined in a solemn manner to manifest His wrath & to make known His power, His power of condemnation, and He had shown them in the overthrow of Pharaoh, v. 17. The men who were affected by the divine wrath are called *σκεπὴν ὀργῆς*, that is, vessels, not instruments of wrath. These stand in contrast to the *σκεπὴν ἐλεος*, the vessels of mercy, v. 13 & the men who experienced mercy. In the preceding sections the Epistle had spoken concerning obscurity & contrasted the objects of mercy to the objects of the hardening. The objects of wrath are therefore to him identical with the objects of the

the meaning is that God has endured in great patience the vessels of wrath not only for their own sakes, (but also for the purpose that He might manifest the richness of His glory to the vessels of mercy, κχι ἵνα γυμνασῇ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἐλεούς. What the apostle understands under the riches of the glory of God one sees from the following words from v. 24: οὗς κχι ἐκάλειεν, ἡμᾶς etc., which evidently describe the realization of the divine purpose. God would thereby glorify Himself and has also glorified Himself thereby, that He has called, has converted us to Christ, from among Jews and Gentiles. It was in the δόξα τῆς χάριτος, meant in 8.14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

With the apostle ἡμεῖς and ἐκείνοι the apostle points back to historical facts. We have remarked above on v. 15, that with the σὺν ἡμῖν he pointed to the observant Jews. In the preceding historical discussion in chap. 9-11 he speaks throughout of the fate of Israel at whose side he then places the fate of the Gentiles. And so also, when he spoke concerning the vessels of wrath, whom God had endured with great patience, he has his fellow countrymen in mind, who at the time when he wrote such things were accused from Christ. The reference of the statement in v. 22 to the Jews, which is also found already among the ancients, has been defended among the modern ones too, namely, Weiss & Zöfel. It was a great day of grace for Israel, when Christ, who is God over all, had taken the flesh & blood of man out of Israel & walked about among His people & sought & would have saved that which was lost. He had come to His own, & His own had not received Him. At the close of His public activity He cried out to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and

from Christ. The reference of the statement in v. 22 to the Jews, which is also found already among the ancients, has been defended among the modern ones too, namely, Weiss & Zöfel. It was a great day of grace for Israel, when Christ, who is God over all, had taken the flesh & blood of man out of Israel & walked about among His people & sought & would have saved that which was lost. He had come to His own, & His own had not received Him. At the close of His public activity He cried out to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and

This word applies in general to the inhabitants of Judea: "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, & ye would not." Matt. 23:37. When the nation of the Jews, the great multitude, the leaders of the people, nailed their Messiah to the cross, then they had almost fulfilled the measure of their sins, then they were already ripe, for condemnation. It would not have been too severe, if God had immediately exterminated this generation of the murderers of Christ from the earth. Cf. Matt. 23:32. But God had patience & still granted to the disobedient children a longer period of grace. The twelve apostles and Jesus, Jesus doing anything else, attested to this people the salvation which Christ had merited, for sinners were suffering & death, & preached to them repentance & forgiveness of sins. Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, always first of all, wherever he came, spoke the word of God to the Jews of the Diaspora. When certainly the Jews everywhere, the great majority, hardened themselves against the word of Jesus Christ; the crucified & risen One, then the judgment of God was directed & justified itself, which had already begun in the days of Christ, & the hour of wrath was no longer very far off. That was in 1 Thess. 2:16 concerning the Jews, who persecuted the apostles & prevented the Gentiles from being saved, that the wrath of God had already begun to come over them. Εξ οὗ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀπορίας ὅτι ὁ πῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ. The judgment of wrath in the year 70 A.D. appears according to the history to be the execution for Christ, as a (prelude & beginning of the judgment of the world. Cf. Matt. 13:41; Mark 13; Luke 21. At the same time, in this last period of the history of the people of Israel the Church of the N.Y. was built up in the Gentile world, especially from the service of Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles. Even in these days God has manifested His riches of His glory to the poor, wandering Gentiles who were about the rivers of this wilderness. When the Jews did not consider the nation worthy of eternal life, then the Gentiles turned to the Gentiles & gained a rich harvest out from among the nations of the Gentiles. In whose name the house of Christ was erected & brought forth fruit, then a new number of Jews was added to the Church of Christ. There are the historical facts, the great acts of God, to which we look back from our passage which is a new turning place, which is written in letters. Nevertheless, the work of the patience & mercy of God also, since that time has had its success, & is still in progress today. God knew the needs of mankind in general, that would be the individual. God waits long time & continues, for a long time with all wisdom, admonition, & invitation, before finally abandoning & rejecting a nation. That applies to the whole world. God is very long suffering & waits with His love & with His love & with His love. He will give the need of wrath opportunity for repentance. And in such great patience He waits the goddess, Christ, for the world, which is now a case for the judgment, and with His grace that from all the ends of the earth many souls will be saved & won for the eternal kingdom, that the number of the elect shall be filled. (The apostles were necessary to the content of the individual parts of the mission, we come)

Look to the construction of the sentence in v. 22.23. The facts mentioned here are introduced with E' , S' , and

(The question is, which in the apodosis is in this conditional sentence, & whether in general there is an apodosis to be found. Evidently a new sentence structure begins in v. 27. And so with most expositors, for example, Frutych, De Wette, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, Weiss, Hodel & Luthardt we take the entire sentence in v. 22-23 as a question, whose answer the hypothesis comes to the reader, viz. that it supplies it of itself. If God, altho He would show wrath, etc., nevertheless has borne the vessels of wrath, also for the purpose mentioned in v. 23, what follows then? "His 'aporia pericula' is 'is' corresponds completely to our: 'Wie aber wenn ...?' " Weiss. But how, if God has done that which is said in v. 22-23, how has He then really done it? Do you then also still dispute with God? Must not all contradictions then be silenced? How the note asserted in v. 22 if, suppress all resistance against God will first be evident when we have pursued the description of these, acts to the end, v. 29.

To the interrogative sentence in vv. 22-23 there is joined an affirmative proposition which begins with the words, which we have already taken into consideration above: οὕς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, οὐ μόνον ἐξ ἑοῦ σαῖν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν, v. 24. The εἰς here looks to αὐτοὺς ἐλθεῖν, ὃ πρόφηταί· ποιοῦσι· εἰς τὸν νῆα, where the objects are named. It does not translate: "above all persons being invited."

1. The relative clause, being independent except & otherwise never has a predication
accruing with it. The relative obj. is much rather to be taken together with the personal pronoun ἡμεῖς as
its complement, similarly as the Hebrew וְאֵלֶּיךָ includes supplement in a following personal
obj. p. so you see similar constructions in Mark 7:20: ὁ γυνὴ, ἥς εἰπὺν τὸ δοξαζέτωσιν αὐτῆς
τοῦτο καὶ ἐκείνη· οὗ· Luke 9:16. ὁ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὗ· εἰ οὕτως εἶμι· ἔκαστος δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν τῶν
ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου· καὶ οὕτως· John 8:12. ὅτι εἰδόσης νότον·. Literar. grammatik des Neutestaments
v. L. Deichsch. Barc. 5^e, 4. according to the German manner as given the wording somewhat thus: "Und er
hat es denn auch uns gesagt" (Mt. 11: 2. "I have us, whom he hath called"). Corresponding to this precisely,
expressed figuratively, God has now called us, we who are now Christians, not only from among the Jews,
but also from among the Gentiles. That, where of the apostle has spoken, that God intended it, has really
taken place in the calling, which has really come to pass as in the present Christians." Hofmann.

There follow in vv. 25, 26 two quotations from the Prophet Hosea, 2, 25. 1. Καὶ ἐσὶ τοῖς οὐκ ἁγίοις μου ἁγίοις μου, καὶ τῇν οὐκ ἡγαπήμην ἡγαπήμην· καὶ ἔστι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐπαγγέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐκ ἁγίοις μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται· υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος. "Ich will das, was nicht mein Volk war, mein Volk nennen und die nicht Geliebte Geliebte; und es wird sein an dem Ort, wo zu ihnen gesagt worden: Ihr seid nicht mein Volk, da werden sie Söhne des lebendigen Gottes genannt werden." "For I will call them my people, which were not my people; they beloved, which was not beloved, and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God." The words which introduce this twofold statement of the prophet, οὐκ καὶ

in the N. 22:29. "wie es auch bei Noa her ist." For "wie es auch bei Noa her ist" ("as he said also in Gen. 22:29") evidently and themselves to the immediacy, preceding expression, 22:18-20 (Gen. 22:29). And it is almost generally acknowledged that Paul repeats the words of "Noa" to the calling & welcoming of the Gentiles, certainly with full right. Most modern exegesis, however, takes in Noa only an indirect reference to the Gentiles, since he here, as they suppose, first of all prophesies the reacceptance of the apostate Children of Israel. His remark on Noa 22:18. When Peter in his first letter, which according to the correct opinion of almost all modern exegesis was written to Gentile Christians, introduces the words of compromise when Paul introduces the same words "us in connection with us" (apostate) for the calling of the Gentiles to the adoption of God in Christ, then that is not a mere application of that which was said concerning Israel to the Gentiles, or only exalting of their thoughts in 22:20 words (Huther, Wiesinger), but a demonstration out of the basic thought, our prophecy. When their apostate Israel had become like the Gentiles, had fallen out of the covenant & gave up with the Lord. Consequently the reacceptance of the Israelites as children of God was an actual proof for the fact that God also accepts the Gentile world as His children. Because God had promised to accept the Children of Israel, therefore He must also accept the Gentiles. Otherwise that would mean a supposition, a supposition which cannot be considered in God. (Nigel). Philippi writes: "In the prophets the (divine) vision concerning the reacceptance of the apostate kingdom of Israel. Nevertheless the quotation of the prophet is to be regarded not only as an application, but as a proof passage. Indeed the conduct of God over against apostate Israel comprises the law of His action over against the apostates in general; Israel had also become like the Gentiles in their apostasy, the announcement of the reacceptance of the Children of Israel as children of God thus contained in reality since God did not have mercy exclusively according to His own will, but also a prophecy of the acceptance of the Gentile world." Hagen: "The passage, Noa 22:29, treats of the Israelite offspring, except of his Ten Tribes, to whom God promised pardon & reconciliation as the people of God. The apostle recognizes in this pardoning the type of the acceptance of the Gentiles to salvation, & consequently in the Messianic sense as a prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles." Koch: "Hagen calls attention to the fact that the Gentiles, because they were in a way like the apostate Israel, found themselves in the same circumstances as the Gentiles, so that what had been said of the former could also be referred to these latter in a similar manner. There is with Hagen the recollection that in the religion a general truth, which is expressed with reference to a special case & is common, is, without regard to all those whose character & circumstances are given in some. And actually in the words of Paul the Gentiles, which were not my people, which were not in the world, which must be regarded as Gentiles, were as well as similar to those repeat themselves, to which they had originally referred." One can now see the application of the demonstration of

proof of Paul into harmony with the content of the prophetic word. No such round-about way is needed, if one correctly considers the context of the latter: also its connection with the A.T. prophecy in general. In the last chapter of his prophecy Hosea announces to the idol-worshipping king-dom of the Ten Tribes that the Lord would not pardon them, further, that they should become not a people, that they should become like the Gentiles, and when the tribes disappeared into the Gentile world after their removal into the Assyrian Captivity. To the threat there is added immediately a promise, & certainly a Messianic promise, which begins in 1:10 with the words: "Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; & it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God." The first sentence of this prophecy is evidently an echo of the patriarchal promise, which Abraham had already received. Gen. 12, 3; 15, 5; 17, 5; 22, 17. We have shown above on Rom. 7, 17 that this numberless seed of Abraham, which is compared to the stars of the heavens & the sand of the sea, is none other than the spiritual posterity, which Abraham should gain out of all the generations of the earth. In conformity with that, also the "children of Israel" in Hos. 1, 10, whom there shall be as many as the sand of the sea, i.e. the members of the N.T. people of God; the place where one says to them, "Ye are not my people," is the land of the Gentiles; those who are

(called not His people are the Gentiles to whom also the Israelites belong who had become like the Gentiles; & the Gentiles who here prophesied that at one time, in the Messianic period, they shall be called & shall be children of the living God. With this agrees the continuation of the prophecy, v. 11: "Then shall the children of Judah & the children of Israel be gathered together, & appoint themselves one head, & they shall come up out of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel." These words cannot be understood otherwise than concerning the gathering of the New Testament Church out of all nations, concerning the one fold under the one shepherd, John 10, 16, which is described here with Old Testament expressions under the image of the return home from the captivity. For the Children of Israel in the real sense of the word in differentiation from the children of Judah, the Ten Tribes have never returned to Canaan from the exile. And when it reads further, v. 1: "Say ye unto your brethren, Ammi ("mein Volk"); & to your sisters, Ruhamah ("Begrüßte ich"), & in v. 23: "I will wonder unto me in the earth; & I will have merry upon her that had not obtained mercy; & I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people; & they shall say, Thou art my God" - then according to the connection there is a pointing there to the mercy which the Gentiles should experience. Therefore Paul correctly sees in Hos. 2, 23; 1, 10 a direct scriptural proof, for the calling, conversion, and

pardon of the Gentiles. He quotes according to the Septuagint, in that he only turns the members of the Gentiles around in the first prophetic statement & simplifies the expression by permitting ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ποτε γὰρ ὡς ἔστιν ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ναὶ ὡς ναὶ to be dependent likewise on καὶ ὡς ναὶ.

At the side of the double citation of the Prophet Hosea concerning the Gentiles in vv. 27-29 there is placed a two-fold testimony of the Prophet Isaiah, which refers to Israel. With the words ἵνα ὡς

וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁתָּחֲוֶה לְיְהוָה. "Sicut autem dicitur, 'et Israel adorabit dominum', (the beautiful part of all introductions the word of prophecy, which is, and is recorded (in Isa. 1: 22, 23. That reads exactly according to the original: "Denn wannach dein Volk, Israel, wie ein die Hand an Meere, so wird ein Rest davon sich bekehren. Denn Narren und Heuchler sind immer vorzüglich am Eigensinn, der Herr jedoch in mitten der ganzen Erde." (Ps. 1: "For the thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return: the consumption decreed shall overcome with righteousness. For the Lord God of hosts shall make a consumption, even determined, in the midst of all the land.") When the final time comes, that is the meaning, before the judgment described in 1. 15, 1 over Assyria, the cruel world, & the world powers, on the days of the Messiah, a remnant from Israel shall be converted. That had already been brought into prominence in the preceding statement, v. 11. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁתָּחֲוֶה לְיְהוָה. "The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God," that is, to Christ Emmanuel, Isa. 9: 5. Certainly it shall be only a remnant, even if the nation of Israel were as numerous as the sand of the sea. The great mass of the people of Israel shall not be converted. But the unconverted, hardened multitude shall finally experience in the following sentence. God had issued a decree, & certainly a strong, irrevocable decree, had come to an irrevocable decision, וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁתָּחֲוֶה לְיְהוָה. The verb וְיִשְׁתָּחֲוֶה, means: to designate something as to be done. The content of the divine decision is utter ruin, extermination, וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁתָּחֲוֶה לְיְהוָה, and certainly an extermination, "welche da herwogt, das ist wogend da herbringet Gerechtigkeith, also wie ein Wogenachwail (surging of waves) göttliche Gerechtigkeith herbeikommt, nämlich die Gerechtigkeith." "Solitzsch. The divine judgment of punishment shall now itself run over the marra, verditus as in streams. Yes, in the midst of the whole earth the Almighty, the Lord of Sabaoth, shall complete the strictly determined utter ruin. The judgment of wrath upon Israel also appears here as the beginning, or the final judgment, or the judgment of the world. The Septuagint abridges from the Hebrew text according to the form. The significant וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁתָּחֲוֶה is reproduced with τὸ καὶ ἡ εἰρημὸς ὡς ὁ θεὸς τῶν, "the remnant shall be saved." Still the deliverance is certainly the result of conversion. The convenience reads in the Greek: λόγον καὶ ἐκδοτικὸν καὶ ἐκδοτικὸν (εκδ. ἐκδ. ὁ θεὸς) ἐν τῷ καὶ ὡς ὁ θεὸς τῶν. λόγον ἐκδοτικὸν καὶ ἐκδοτικὸν. Ποιῶν δὲ ὁ θεὸς κύριος τῶν συνάψεων ἐν ἐκδοτικῷ ἐκδοτικῷ. That would say: God executes His verdict, His verdict of judgment, & certainly is a final, definite manner. The verb ἐκδοτικὸν, which evidently corresponds to the Hebrew וְיִשְׁתָּחֲוֶה, signifies, I used concerning as an each, to sum something up, & then in general: to settle something shortly, summarily, or finally, to finish something. Yes, not only in Israel, but upon the whole earth, in the whole world. God, the Lord Sabaoth, shall accomplish His verdict of judgment. One sees that in spite of the not different the essential sense & content of the basic text comes into expression also in the

Greek translation. Paul quotes according to the Septuagint, still so, that in the first statement he introduces the expression $\delta \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \mu \acute{o} \varsigma \tau \omega \nu \nu \acute{\iota} \omega \nu$ ($\delta \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \mu \acute{o} \varsigma$), for $\delta \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \mu \acute{o} \varsigma \tau \omega \nu \nu \acute{\iota} \omega \nu$, which designates the adequate contrast to $\kappa \alpha \tau' \alpha \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$, resp. $\epsilon \nu \theta \acute{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$, and significantly shortens the second sentence. For the reading well-authenticated by A B B: $\lambda \omicron \gamma \omicron \varsigma \nu \gamma \alpha \rho \sigma \upsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \delta \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \upsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \mu \upsilon \nu \nu \tau \omicron \varsigma \eta \rho \sigma \epsilon \iota \kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \nu \gamma \gamma \eta$, "denn einen Spruch wird der Herr rollend und abrollend und aufhrewend & Erdem" ("because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth"), is most certainly the original. The more extensive reading of the later codices explains itself easily by the assumption that the copiers have inserted the complete text of the Septuagint. It satisfies the purpose of the Epistle that he names the judgment of extermination & condemnation to which the unrepentant Israel has fallen, in the shortest form, because by the contrast he would only bring to light the previous statement, on which he here places all emphasis, the $\epsilon \nu \theta \acute{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \sigma \omega \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$. The other quotation, Isa. 1, 9: "Wenn nicht der Herr Gebroth uns erlassen hätt, so wären wir wie Sodom geworden und Gomorra gleich geworden" ("Except the Lord of Sodom had left us a seed, we had been as Sodom, & had been like unto Gomorrah"), is taken from a discussion of penitence & punishment, which is of general content and which Isaiah therefore has placed, as it were, as an introduction to his book of his prophecy. In this prophecy, in chap. 1, Isaiah depicts in short, marked strokes the disobedient, unrepentant Israel, as it was at his time & has remained the same in later times, & threatens them with the judgment, which already began in his days & which finally was completed in the great catastrophe of the year 70 A.D. There the divine wrath poured out from heaven over Judah & Jerusalem, similarly as once over the godless cities of Sodom & Gomorrah. As far as the statement of the Prophet Isaiah concerns the future of Israel, Paul designates it correctly as a word of prophecy in the real sense, in that he writes $\kappa \alpha \theta \omega \varsigma \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \rho \eta \gamma \kappa \epsilon \iota \tau \eta \varsigma \alpha \iota \omega \nu \alpha \varsigma$, "wie Esaias zuvor gesagt hat" ("as Esaias said before"). All rebellious children are dedicated to wrath & condemnation, not only those who are snatched away by such visible judgments of punishment. If Judah had not become entirely like the inhabitants of Sodom & Gomorrah, of whom not one remained, when the Lord destroyed these cities, God had here preserved for Himself a seed, T. 7, 9, really: an escapee. These are the Israelites of the real kind, who have become partakers of the salvation in Christ. That Paul in the first quotation from Isaiah, as we have seen, lays the stress on the statement concerning the remnant which was saved & placed at the side of the same a second statement of Isaiah, which likewise points to the remnant which remained, shows & similarly in what intention he had added the two quotations from Isaiah. He would not here, as many oppositors suppose, contrast the rejection of Israel to the previously collected calling & pardoning of the Gentiles but, as especially Brizzeus & others have proven, to prove the $\epsilon \nu \theta \acute{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \sigma \omega \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ in v. 24 with the words of the Prophet Isaiah, as he has proven the $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha \iota \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ out of the words of the Prophet Hosea. God had called & gathered for Himself a people, but only as this had been prophesied in the writings of the Old Testament, out from among the

Centiles, but also out of the Jews, in spite of the rejection of the great majority, which certainly had also already been proclaimed before and by the prophets.

In view of these facts all contradiction against God must be stilled; the offense which one could take in the sovereign divine will & treatment must pass away. Certainly, not many arguments or positions present the matter, as if the Apostle in this last section, vv. 22-29, modified & limited that which he had written concerning the divine sovereignty in the previous section, vv. 14-21, as if he here introduced the proof that God actually made no use of the prerogative which belonged to Him. This is not the case. What he had previously said of the fact that God has mercy upon whom He will & hardens whom He will, & that He has a right to that as Creator & Sovereign, remains; that is the truth of which Paul takes back not one iota, and that is & remains for the carnal mind a stumbling block & an offense & for the believing Christians a holiness tangere. But after Paul has established those facts in vv. 1-11 which are incomprehensible for us & are held themselves against all opposition, he places at the side of the same other facts, which are added by means of the 3rd & 4th & 5th in v. 12, which exclude all false deductions, which one might be able to draw from them, all perverted thoughts concerning God. After he had shown his readers, from afar, as it were, the great & majestic God, out of the arguments presented above, he immediately turns their vision away again, from the blinding divine majesty & places before their eyes (the God of all mercy & the salutary will of God, as He is attested in the Scriptures & as He is clearly manifested in the history, in the calling of the Jews & Gentiles & in the gathering of the Church, and when we now correctly consider that which he expounds in vv. 22-29, when we bear in mind with what great patience God at first for so long a time had endured the objects of His wrath, the vessels of wrath & how He had earnestly sinned & sought another salvation & how He fully utilized & still fully uses the time of patience in order to proclaim the riches of His glory in the vessels of mercy, how He has gathered for Himself a people out of the perverted & disobedient Jews & Gentiles & also how He has remembered Himself out of His special generation of the Jews, further bear in mind also how this has not happened by chance, but in conformity with the Scriptures according to God's counsel & will, then, humanly speaking, an suspicion disappears, as if this God could deal partially & unjustly. When we lose all desire & inclination to investigate that which is too high for us, & submerge ourselves with all the thoughts of our minds into the abyss of divine mercy, which stands open to all men, we rejoice with our whole heart over the salvation which we and others have experienced.

We can include the content of the second half of this chapter, vv. 14-29, in the following statement:

The Apostle stresses emphatically that God calls the Jews, who convert & hardens whom He will. Swarms against sinning least with the divine majesty, but points at the same time in the Scriptures & into history & shows how God with great patience bore the vessels of wrath according to His rich mercy has gathered a people of His election & has called out from among the Jews & Gentiles.

9, 30-10, 21. The Faith of the Gentiles & the Unbelief of Israel.

9, 30-33.

In the turn of the discourse, 11: 33 & 12: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, a new sphere of thought, & certainly so, that stands in connection with that which was said previously. Nevertheless there is not in our passage, as in the above added passages, introduced a presumed or an actual distinction, but the law is only to the last words of the previous section, in order to join the discussion now has in mind with that. He had previously quoted two statements from the Prophet Isaiah, which asserted that God had preserved for Himself out of Israel a remnant, a seed, & had shown that this prophecy was now being carried out, in that God had called for Himself a people also out of the Jews then the Gentiles. Nevertheless it is still only a remnant out of Israel which is converted & saved. And this remnant stands in contrast to the great multitude of the Children of Israel, who are compared to the sand of the sea, who in conformity with even those words of the prophet have fallen to extermination & condemnations. In that Paul also quotes that which Isaiah had written concerning the mass of perdition, he had come back to the principle thought of the historical amplification, which had begun in 9: 1, the rejection of Israel, namely, of the great majority of the people. And now he raises the question: "Was sollen wir nun sagen?" ("What shall we say then?"). What shall we judge here? In that he immediately answers this question, he asserts a fact which one must really keep in mind, if one would correctly understand & judge the lamentable fate of Israel. He points, first of all to the fact that while the Gentiles have received the righteousness wrought, Israel had remained behind in righteousness. For in the double statement in 11: 30 & 31, the emphasis evidently lies on the second half. In this context, a brief, many, correctly remarks, it speaks of Israel, & the Gentiles are considered only in contrast to Israel.

The Gentiles have not followed after righteousness, have not troubled themselves in any manner about righteousness, their aims & endeavors were rather directed to the satisfaction of the sinful flesh. But, behold, entirely unwrought righteousness has come into their paths in the word of the Gospel to them in their course of sin, & certainly the true righteousness, of which the Apostle had given sufficient testimony in this letter, the righteousness which avails before God, "die aus dem Glauben ist" ("which is of faith"), which is imparted to sinful man as a result of faith. And so they have received, taken possession of, the righteousness without any cooperation & trouble on their part, without running, have carried away, as 11: 32, 33, the same, as it were, as a prize of a running match. The righteousness together with faith, which appends itself to the same, appears here as a pure gift of the grace of God, which falls to those who do not seek it, much rather seek & strive after its opposite. Thus we here have confirmed the basic statement expressed in 1: 16, that God himself has given the righteousness & with that the condition of ~~truth~~ salvation is independent of all willing & running of man, since faith is the opposite to all activity & above that is worked by God Himself. Weier. What the Apostle testifies concerning the Gentiles serves him only in the

fact, as already remarked, of bringing into light the contrast, which applies to Israel. We take the 31. verse, corresponding to its meaning, but of all as an independent sentence, independent of the 31. in 1. 30, and read it according to the oldest manuscripts in the following manner: $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\gamma\lambda\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\ \epsilon\beta\theta\alpha\omicron\varsigma$. Israel had done in it what the Gentiles had not done, had driven away rightness, or, as Paul expresses himself, here, the law of righteousness. We understand under $\nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ not some inborn, according to which righteousness is received ("Weisheit"), the ideal of righteousness which is put forward to realization, ("Philosophie"), nor the idea of a justifying law ("Meyon"), but with most expositors, since the discussion is concerning Israel's striving of Israel, the law which Israel had, the Mosaic law. It is here named after righteousness, because it shows man what is right before God, because it demands righteousness, & certainly perfect righteousness. Israel had been behind the law, that means, had earnestly endeavored to fulfill its demands, at least outwardly. Still this striving was in vain. Israel has not attained to the law, had not fulfilled the demands of the law, thus had remained behind in righteousness. What lies in the expression $\sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ and $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$, Hermann has clarified with the following words: "That the expression $\sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon$ does not mean to seek, but to be behind, of the law, which Israel had, because one tries only to attain it, one does not yet possess it, is an obvious objection. $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ (Gen. 27. 11) means not to seek to get the wine, but to be behind it, to drink it, and $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\gamma\lambda\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omega\upsilon$ (Hebr. 12. 14) does not mean to seek to obtain peace, but to be therein, to live at peace with all, and $\sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ (Rom. 14. 19) does not mean to want to place oneself in possession of the thing, but to permit it to be applied to oneself. So here $\sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\upsilon\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ is a designation of the course of a law, which teaches what is right, not in order to attain to the possession of the same, but in order to do what it demands. Because Israel had such a law, therefore they would be behind it and outside of it in fulfilling it. And this was indeed the tendency in the life of his people, so that it has still not thereby arrived at a law, has not become what the Gentiles are designated with the expression $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$. And that is thus now Israel with all its striving after righteousness has still remained behind the law of righteousness & thereby behind righteousness itself, according to which will be measured and judged what Paul had previously written concerning the wrath & judgment, which has befallen Israel, which is the basis of the rejection of Israel. Rightness & certainly perfect righteousness, $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ is the preliminary condition of salvation, $\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \gamma\gamma\iota\alpha$. "That the Gentile had already brought into prominence in the introduction of his letter, i. 1. 7. Therefore whoever is here empty of righteousness has nothing else to expect than wrath & judgment. This reiteration of the analogy of Israel finds its completion in the following statement.

The Apostle asks: $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$ ("Why has Israel not attained to the law, has never come so far that they stand themselves in harmony with the law?") answers: $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma$.

und einen Stein des Anstoßes und wer auf ihn stößt wird nicht zu Schanden werden" ("Behold, I lay in Zion a stumbling stone & rock of offense; & whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed"). In this quotation there are two prophetic statements woven together into one short expression. In Isa. 28, 16 it reads: "Darum spricht der Allherr Jehovah: Siehe, ich bin, der gegründet in Zion einen Stein, einen Stein der Bewährung einen köstlichen Eckstein wohlgegründeter Gründung = der blühende Frucht nicht!" ("Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste"). - וְיִצְחָק נֶאֱמָר וְיִצְחָק אֶתְּנֶה אֶתְּנֶה אֶתְּנֶה according to the Septuagint, which apparently had read וְיִצְחָק instead of וְיִצְחָק. The precious stone, which the Lord laid in Zion, is, as among the modern ones also, David & Delitzsch acknowledge, the son of David, the Messiah of Israel, upon whom the Church of the New Testament should build itself. Paul quotes the first, but also the last words of this prophecy in that he had previously thought also of the Gentiles, who had joined themselves in faith to Christ, the Rock of salvation, had built upon this corner stone, & in order to point out how easily Israel also could share in our salvation in Christ. But no, Israel had rejected the salvation of this King Messiah, & so the Rock of salvation has become for them a stone of stumbling & a rock of offense. Therefore Paul designates the Stone, which God had laid in Zion, immediately as אֶתְּנֶה אֶתְּנֶה אֶתְּנֶה and וְיִצְחָק. The last words are taken from the prophecy in Isa. 28, 16-17: "Nicht denn, daß ich, dem sollt ihr heiligen, und für euer Thron, und für euer Thron, es wird euer Thron sein; dagegen zu einem Stein des Anstoßes und zu einem Eckstein der Bewährung den zu mir, in Zion, zu einem Eckstein und zu einem Eckstein der Bewährung der Bewohner Jerusalems. Und es werden sie stürzen und unter ihnen viele und fallen und zerbrechen und zerbröckeln und gefangen werden!" (Nominally the Lord of hosts himself; yet him be your fear, yet him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling & for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel, for a gin & a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, & fall, & be broken, & be snared, & be taken). This is likewise a messianic prophecy. The Lord Jehovah, of whom the discussion is here, is Christ-Immanuel according to the context. He shall be to the devout, believing children of Israel a sanctuary, a protecting asylum, but on the other hand to both houses of Israel, that is, to the disobedient, unbelieving Israel, a stone of stumbling & a rock of offense, וְיִצְחָק אֶתְּנֶה אֶתְּנֶה אֶתְּנֶה and וְיִצְחָק אֶתְּנֶה אֶתְּנֶה. The great mass of the people, who rejected Christ-Immanuel, Christ shall & should serve only to this end, that they stumble on Him & take offense in Him, come to a fall on Him, & be broken in pieces. Thus far it had come with Israel, when Paul wrote this letter. Christ had appeared & had presented himself to his people as the promised Helper & deliverer. The Gentiles of Christ had, out of all Europe to the Jews, that there is salvation in no other than Him, the crucified & risen One. But Israel, the great majority, from the beginning had stumbled & taken offense in Christ & established themselves in hostility.

against Christ. And so now according to God's righteous destiny Christ now set Himself, so that they
(further & always more strenuously stumbled & took offense in Him & finally came to a fall in
Him & were broken in pieces. Therefore the Gospel here points to the severe guilt of Israel, the unbelief in-
creasing to full maturity & certainly as the adequate cause of condemnation & damnation. As for
the rest, it goes in the same manner with all unbelievers. Peter refers the word of the Prophet Isaiah to
all who do not believe, in that he writes of the fact that, for the unbelievers the Stone, which the builders
had rejected & which has become the Cornerstone, has become a stone of stumbling & a rock of offense,
who stumble in unbelief on the word, αἱ τῶν ἀπιστῶν τῶν λίθων ἡ ἀποκλίσμας, 1 Pet. 2, 8. Whoever
does not build on Christ, the Cornerstone, whoever rejects the salvation in Christ & takes offense at Him,
he can finally expect nothing else than that as soon as the word of Christ comes into his ears or into his
mind, he starts up in anger against it & begins to run to his eternal ruin & condemnation. Christ is to
him a savor of death unto death.

Chapter X.

(10, 1-4.

The division of the chapter is not in place here. As remarked above, a new thought-section had
begun already in 9, 32. The introduction of the 10. chapter, 10, 1-4, shows definitely that the theme introduced
in 9, 30-33, concerning the unbelief of Israel as the cause of their rejection, should now again be amplified.
In hoc capite perueniet (oportet) in institute argumenta et prima causa rejectionis Iudeorum,
quae est infidelitas, proprias iustitiae et Christi et quae iustitiae neglectio, exponit. Koerner: Exponit
causam in fine praecedentis capitis causam, cur Iudaei sint rejecti. Israel, inquam, qui sectabatur
legem iustitiae, ad legem iustitiae non peruenit, quia non ex fide, sed tanquam ex operibus. Hanc
causam repetit nunc Paulus et exponit eam copiose. Beng.

But in that Paul now begins to show more closely & to set into the light the severe guilt of Israel, he
first of all wards off once again, as he had already done in 9, 1 ff., the misunderstanding, and he had no
heart & sympathy for his brethren according to the flesh, as if he, because they showed enmity towards him &
his office of apostle to the Gentiles, had now also on his own part become their enemy. He assures his "brethren"
the Christian readers, that he, who as the Apostle to the Gentiles bore the salvation of their souls in a praying

heart, also did not begrudge the salvation to his people Israel, his brethren. You shall not suppose
that he had his desire & enjoyment in judging & condemning Israel. He writes: ὁ ὡς εὐδοκία τῶν ἑθνῶν
καὶ ἰσχύς καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἑθνοῖς, 1. 1. He takes εὐδοκία most properly
with εὐδοκία in its correct meaning "I rejoice in" (rejoice), "I am glad in" (rejoice) (rejoice &
joy of my heart). This meaning then lies very closely with the meaning "I want", as further translators &

ledge, welches das Erkennenden wirklich Richtung auf den Gegenstand des Erkennens zur Voraus-

setzung hat. And now the Jews are not even willing to know God correctly. Even the expression which follows, "aber mit Unverständnis," contains a moral reproach in itself. The Jews were impudent, they do not want to understand. In Rom. 1, 25 it appears as a transgression of fallen mankind in general, that they have not valued God to have Him in knowledge, οὐκ ἔδει, was 1. τὸ θεὸν ἔπειν ἐν ἐπίγνωσει. God has given Himself to be known in the works of creation. But they have not subjectively appropriated to themselves the knowledge of God presented to them, have not directed their thoughts to it, have not given room to it in themselves. Similarly it stands with Israel. God has revealed to them, in His Word, what & how He is & how He would be honored. But they do not deem God fitting & would not have Him as He is & as He has revealed Himself to them, but as they would suppose & would have Him. And therefore their zeal is not a God-pleasing zeal. The real zeal for God, the correct worship of God holds itself within the bounds of the revelation of God & does not follow one's own thoughts & one's own notions. Pheg: bene colendus quidem est, non autem iuxta hominis electum et arbitrium, sed iuxta spiritus sancti decretum et mandatum. Rursum, igitur hoc loco de hominum studio in colendo & recte iudicare. Vulgaria enim error est, quod homines sentiant, divinitus approbari, quicquid studio colendi dei faciendum susceperint.

Bene, inquit, animo audio Mieram Pontificiam, bene intentione a clero ligeamus aut liquorem statuum excipit. Et abest longissime, ut id faciam colendi idoli, sed tantum colendi veri dei gratia. Paulus autem hoc loco pie et discrete exponit, quid de tali hominum studio sit sentiendum. Non enim sufficit, ut aliquid zelo dei et bona animi intentione faceretur suscipiamus, sed erigitur, ut hic zelus et haec intentio sit secundum scientiam. And certainly the objection such scientia is a quality & damnable inertia, as Boerhaave says concerning the gelus Judaeorum: qui est naturae ex inertia et verbi dei contentus.

Now, as the Jews were zealous in ignorance, how far they denied the correct knowledge is expressed by the words: ἡ γὰρ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς ἰδίας ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἡ τῆς δικαιοσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐπὶ ἐπίγνωσιν. 1. 3. The participial clause preceding the principal clause here has the emphasis on this, on the other hand, the first part. For the ἡ γὰρ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ evidently corresponds to the οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, & the object of ἡ γὰρ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ presents what the Jews have not known & have not wanted to know. That is ἡ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη, and with that is meant here, as the contrast ἡ ἰδία δικαιοσύνη shows, the righteousness which proceeds from God. God has prepared righteousness for the sinners & revealed & offered it to them in the gospel. Yes, God had given this to be known especially by Israel in the house, as already in Moses & the prophets, how inhuman shall be justified before God, that He Himself, God, out of pure grace had prepared for man a perfectly satisfying righteousness & that even this is the proper veneration of God, when man rightly acknowledges such grace of God. But of that the Jews know nothing & do not want to know it, about since Boerhaave. They do not pay attention to the righteousness of God. There certainly the last part

the gospel. Yes, God had given this to be known especially by Israel in the house, as already in Moses & the prophets, how inhuman shall be justified before God, that He Himself, God, out of pure grace had prepared for man a perfectly satisfying righteousness & that even this is the proper veneration of God, when man rightly acknowledges such grace of God. But of that the Jews know nothing & do not want to know it, about since Boerhaave. They do not pay attention to the righteousness of God. There certainly the last part

to the others well known dictum, Rom. 3:28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the

deeds of the law." We translate with Luther: "Christus ist der Seeliger Ende," and thus take it in its nearest meaning, "Ende," not in the meaning "Zweck" (purpose), or even "Erfüllung" (fulfillment) which it does not even have. For the meaning of the Greek is evident, that the Law ceases in Christ & makes place for the righteousness of faith. The Law places upon man demands, earnest demands, requires perfect righteousness, therefore it had previously been called "Law of righteousness." And now if the demands of the Law are all fulfilled, then the Law has reached its end, then it has no more to say to man. But now Christ has fulfilled, perfectly fulfilled all the demands of the Law in man's stead. And so with Christ the Law has come to an end, justice has been done to it. Self-evidently the question dealt with here is only, how man is justified before God's ear. With that the Law has nothing to do, that the Law otherwise still has a place in the Church of Christ, which is therefore the correct use of the Law, has been shown sufficiently above, in 3:25; 7:12. But at what it is aimed by the fact that Christ is the end of the Law, at what God has aimed, is stated by the second part of the dictum. εἰς δίκαιωσιν πάντων τοῦ νόμου, "fürs Berichtigung jedum, der das glaubt" ("for righteousness to every one that believeth"). This purpose is now reached. In that Christ has now fulfilled the Law & brought it to an end, righteousness, perfect righteousness, is now at hand for

everyone who believes. Man only needs to take the fulfillment of the Law, the obedience of Christ, this present righteousness in faith. Whoever always appropriates Christ's life with the righteousness coincided in him in faith has righteousness. Luther says very briefly, but according to the sense very fittingly translated: "Wer an den glaubt, der ist gerecht," not "wird gerecht" but "ist gerecht." "Whoever takes Christ in faith, appropriates himself in faith with Christ the righteousness which was procured by Christ & is present in Christ and is so *ipso facto* justified before God. And this fact, in which the N. T. history of salvation's economy is concentrated, that Christ has come & has fulfilled the Law & thus brought it to an end, these facts of the case, which lie open to the light, that righteousness is present in Christ & everyone who believes in him is justified & no longer exposed to the demands or remonstrances of the Law, now serve the apostle, as is shown by the *yp* which introduces the sentence in v. 4, as a proof for the fact that the Jews are very ignorant & would not see & know what there is about the righteousness of God. For in the foregoing Galatians, in v. 26. 3. the emphasis lies upon οὐκ ἔτι γινώσκουσιν, and ἡ νόμος ὅτι γινώσκουσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔτι γινώσκουσιν. The apostle has the right to accuse the Jews of their very misunderstanding; for, as he expressed it even in v. 4, that is confessedly the purpose of the sending of Christ & that the Jews ignored. If they had opened their eyes & not wilfully closed them against the bright light of the N. T. against

the truth & fact attested in v. 4, then they would not have sought the Law again, would not set up their own righteousness, much rather would they have acknowledged the true righteousness of God & given place for the same in themselves. This connection of thoughts presents itself, enforced from the foregoing words of the text, while the other explanations of the *yp* are too far-fetched. Even Holmann & Weiss, yes even Hodge & Philippi finally arrive at the same result, only that the latter in a false manner permit the last words of

the 2. verse, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, to be confirmed by v. 4. As for the rest, that which Paul here writes concerning the Law applies to all unbelievers. That is the clear summary of the Law of God, the unmarriageable child of the true religion: Christ is the end of the Law; every one that believes in Him is justified. And so it is an inexcusable misunderstanding, when one still does not know where he should look for righteousness, salvation &c. He, when one misunderstands and denies the righteousness procured by God, & instead of that sets up his own righteousness.

The Apostle had previously contrasted "his own righteousness", or, what is the same thing, works-righteousness or righteousness of the Law; & the righteousness of God with one another, & showed that the Law has come to a end in & with Christ & has made room, for the righteousness of faith, so that thus the latter absolutely excludes the righteousness of the Law. Now he illustrates this contrast in the following section, v. 5-11, by a detailed description of the entirely dissimilar nature of these double forms of righteousness. The v. 5, which introduces the entire section, is, as we've correctly pointed out, explanatory. Νυνὲς γὰρ ὑπάρχει τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τῇ ἐν τοῦ νόμου; ὅτι ὁ νόμος ἀδικίαν ἀποκάλυψε, ὥστε καὶ ἐν νόμῳ. 10. This dictum of Moses is found in Gen 1, 5 and thus reads in Heb: "So will mine iniquities and mine wickedness witness against me, witness that I have done evil." "So shall therefore keep my statutes & my judgments; which, if I cannot do, he shall live in them" — וְאֵלֹהִים יִשְׁמְרֵנִי וְאֵלֹהִים יִשְׁמְרֵנִי וְאֵלֹהִים יִשְׁמְרֵנִי וְאֵלֹהִים יִשְׁמְרֵנִי. That would say: If I believe, none performs the statutes & laws of God shall receive life, the true eternal life & thus become in debt to him. What appears to be the righteousness of the Law; with this righteousness it depends on the action. The righteousness of the Law could in no way be that one does that, the claim, does also that which God has bidden in the Law of Moses & omits nothing of it. Justitia legis est regimē integrum, acce, docet perfectam obedientiam & expositam circumdant legem. However, it however really fulfills the Law perfectly thereby gains its place is saved. The preliminary condition of salvation is nothing else than perfect obedience. On the other hand: "Cursed is everyone that continues not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them." Lev. 24, 21; Gal. 3, 10. Certainly there has never been a man who kept all the Commandments of God, who has fulfilled his Law perfectly, & thus there has never been a man who has been saved in his own very, & also in the future there shall never be a man saved by the works of the Law. By the works of the Law we are dead by justice. The righteousness of the Law is found in no man on earth. The righteousness of the Law does not exist in reality, but only as a demand — "God upon man" as a condition laid down by God, as condition of the reception of salvation, as the dictum of Moses in Gen 1, 5, which describes the righteousness of the Law, speaks only of a demand.

is a condition. Even therefore, because the righteousness of the Law has no real quantity, is not actually present on earth, Paul also does not personally the righteousness of the Law, as afterwards the righteousness of faith & does not permit it to speak itself, but only says that Moses thus writes concerning the righteousness out of the Law. Many expositors, for example, also Meyer & Hodge, present the matter so, as if the Law or even the righteousness of the Law had been in the time of the O.T. the way of salvation ordained by God, "the foundation of the winning of salvation," & the righteousness of faith had first become the order solution since Christ, in the time of the N.T. whereby the entire doctrine of Paul is cast overboard. According to the doctrine of Paul, according to the doctrine of the Scriptures there is only one way of salvation for all men at all times, that is faith & the righteousness of faith. Paul had proven in detail in Rom. 4, that Abraham had already been saved & had received the inheritance not by the works of the Law but only by faith. And the same applies to David at the time after the giving of the Law. No, it was God's purpose at no time to make man devout & just & to save him by the Law. Paul denies emphatically that the Law had been given, for that reason, to make man alive. Gal. 3.21. The men who would be justified before God & be saved by the works of the Law follow their own thoughts. Certainly, the Law of Moses is God's Law. The Mosaic Law reveals the eternal, unchangeable will of God. Every thing that God has commanded in the Law is God's earnest demand upon man, upon all men. And to the fulfillment of the Law God has joined life, salvation, to the transgression of the same curse, wrath, death & condemnation. But all that with the purpose that man might know that he has not kept the Commandments of God, that he might know & become aware of his sin, that he has deserved curse & wrath, & that in despair of the righteousness of the Law he might then turn to the righteousness of faith. Thus the Law was in the O.T. & is also still in the N.T. as taskmaster to Christ.

Very differently than with the righteousness of the Law is it with the righteousness of faith. In that the Apostle begins to characterize the latter more closely, he brings in words, sentences in vv. 5-8, which remind one of Deut. 30.11-14. There Moses said to Israel: "For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, & bring it unto us, that we may hear it, & do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, & bring it unto us, that we may hear it, & do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, & in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." Paul gives an answer on this statement of Moses very fittingly in the following manner: "This commandment (cf. 1.1. & 2.1. as in 6, 1 and others of the entire Law) is not too wonderful for you, that means too difficult to grasp, incomprehensible (cf.

2.1.) and also not too far; it is found neither in heaven, that means in the insurmountable heights, nor on the other side of the sea, that means in the unreachable distance, at the ends of the world, so that one could say: who is able to bring it from there?, but it is very close to you, in your mouth & in your heart to do it. It lies, namely, before the eyes not simply contained in the Scriptures, but it is also preached to them orally, & so brought to knowledge, so that it has become a subject of discussion & conversation as well as of

meditation & deliberation. "And in that Paul now personifies the righteousness of faith & introduces it as speaking, he puts the same words into its mouth that are found in this section, from the enemy. Nevertheless he does not by far take all the words of Moses over into this text & changes the expression where it pleases him. He writes according to the Septuagint: τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; certainly without ἤμιν, "Wer wird hinaufsteigen in den Himmel?" ("Who shall ascend into heaven?") - but he does not write: τίς διαβήσεται (ἤμιν) εἰς τὸν ἄβυσσον; but διαβήσεται; "Who will go over the sea?"; but much rather: τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὸν ἄβυσσον; "Wer wird hinabsteigen in die Tiefe?" ("Who shall descend into the deep?"), because this expression alone, like Christ. And he omits the significant threefold mention of the giving of the commandment, of the word, "ταύτα εἰπὼν" ("to do this"), "ταύτα εἰπὼν", & the such doing of the word is the essence of that which he would state concerning the righteousness of faith. From this it is sufficiently clear that the Apostle here does not introduce a real quotation from the LXX in order to crown his discourse as there is not; and in our passage any of its usual formulas of quotations, but that he, as the majority of expositors have recognized, only clothes his own thoughts in Moses' words. The discourse of the righteousness of faith in v. 3-5 is in the words of Moses, which the Apostle uses as a setting substitute for his own thought development ("Philippi"), as the evidence of the Holy Spirit. It is artificial & grammatical activity, when one draws the LXX out of Gen. 22:11, of a physical allegorical speaking of the righteousness of faith. Next indication of Moses speaks simply of the word of the Law & calls into prominence the characteristic by which the Law distinguishes itself from the righteousness of faith, the giving of the word. But many of the Moses' expressions if one looks away from their original sense, permit themselves very well to be used in the purpose of describing the essence of the righteousness of faith. And Paul has done that in our passage. Thus Luther also judges in his quotations ad Rom. 1:17: *dicimus, Quia in data opera nominis. Mos enim ad verbum citari, callens in priora serie, ad abundantiam spiritus ex h. oc. occasionem accipere ad verum justificationis velut novum et proprium istam congruendis. ... Denique non dicit, sic esse scriptum, sed justificationis velut sic dicit agere. Unde Paulus remarks: Et si autem Moses loquens de ego, tamen inaequale. Quia in spiritu recte accommodat ad verbum evangelii, quod, praedicabitur eis.*

The righteousness which is of faith speaks thus: "I speak not in your heart, that is, I think not in your heart: 'Who will ascend into heaven?' or 'Who will descend into the deep?' These questions are not an expression of unbelief, identical with a denial of the incarnation & resurrection of Christ (Meyer), but in conformity with their own & the context "questions of doubt about the possibility of the worthiness of these deeds, as in the LXX passages. "Hominum. Verba. The two additional words in Apost. & Luther's and Luther's Apost. & Luther's words, v. 5, do not contain, as most expositors understand them, the basis of the prohibition, but asking in themselves, that is, in themselves, even so much as, as if one would bring Christ down or bring Christ up, when he is dead, but they are, as, for example, as in Moses, for many accept

them, modifiers of these questions, declarations of the purpose of the ascending & descending. For the double question gives no subjecting sense, when it is not at the same time given what or whom the ascending one or the descending one should bring along out of heaven or out of the deep. And that in the sense of Moses is the true, in this sense, Paul Christ. Accordingly we translate: "desist um Christum herabzuholen" ("that is, to bring Christ down from above") and "desist um Christum von den Toten heraufzuholen" ("that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead"). The meaning of the Apostle is this: No one should think in himself: Who shall ascend into heaven, in order to bring Christ down from heaven. Who shall descend into the deep, into the place of the dead, in order to bring Christ up again from the dead? The one like the other is impossible, but also absolutely not necessary. One does not need to bring Christ, for, one does not need to put Christ into position, first. Christ is not in an inaccessible place. Christ, the Mediator & Savior, is already there. And since the Redeemer is, one cannot pretend as if he were not there, as if he were inaccessible, neither in heaven nor yet in the underworld. "The man, Christ, has already come down from heaven to earth & has completed his work on earth: he has fulfilled all the righteousness of the Law. Christ has already died and risen again from the dead, & has thus effected the cure of the Law, stilled the wrath of God. Christ has with his appearance in the flesh, with his suffering, death & resurrection procured a perfectly sufficient righteousness for sinners. And so in & with Christ the righteousness, which is necessary for man, has already been put into place.

And now the Apostle continues: ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη, as if it had previously been said: ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὐδέποτε ἔσται ἡ ἐκ ἔργων, which according to the sense, certainly contained in the ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως ἔσται ὡς ἡ ἐκ ἔργων ἔσται. The righteousness which is of faith speaks thus: Ἐργὸν σου τὸ πρῶτον ἐστίν, ἐν τῷ στόματι σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. "Nake ist dir das Wort in deinem Mund und in deinem Herzen" ("The word is mighty there, even in thy mouth & in thy heart"). The exact opposite to the foregoing would be: Christ & righteousness is mighty you. However, for that reason, in that he follows the O.T. passage, Paul introduces another subject, & immediately adds which word he has in mind, not the word of which Moses wrote, the Law, but "das Wort, welches wir verkündigen" ("the word which we preach"), thus the word of the apostolic proclamation, the Gospel, and calls this word at the same time "das Wort der Glaubens" ("the word of faith"), that is a word, which would simply be believed, which one does not first have to do, but only take it with its content in faith. This word speaks of Christ's righteousness, comprehends Christ's righteousness in itself & brings both with itself very close to man. Whoever receives this word in faith takes & thereby has Christ & his righteousness which awaits before God. The Apostle places special emphasis on the two expressions ἐν τῷ στόματι σου and ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, in that he explains them in the two following statements. Ὅτι ἐκ δυνάμεως ἡμῶν, ἐν τῷ στόματι σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου πιστεύετε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς πᾶσι ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὐδὲν ἔργον καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς πᾶσι ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὐδὲν ἔργον καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς πᾶσι ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὐδὲν ἔργον καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου.

wenn du mit deinem Munde Jesum als den Herrn bekennst und in deinem Herzen glaubst, dass Gott ihn von den Toten auferweckt hat, so wirst du retig werden. Denn mit dem Herzen glaubt man zur Rechtfertigung, und mit dem Munde bekennet man zur Heiligkeit." ("That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, & shall believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; & with the mouth confession is made unto salvation"). 1. v. 9. 10. We take not only the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in v. 10, but also the $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ in v. 9, similarly as the $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ in Rom. 10 and the $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ in 1 Cor. 1, 25, explicatively. In both statements Paul points the $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ to the confession of the mouth & the $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ to the faith of the heart & emphasizes that the Word of the apostolic proclamation, & in & with this Word the salvation in Christ, is so near to many, that he only needs to believe it with the heart & to confess it with the mouth in order to become a partaker of the same. In the first the emphasis lies on the object of the faith & confession, or much rather of the confession & faith. For here the apostle places the confession of the mouth forward, because in the dictum of Moses the $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ has the first place. He separates the objects of designation and refers them to the confession & faith. Still this division & separation is purely formal, occasioned by the form of the Mosais dictum. The meaning is: If you believe in your heart & confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord & that God has raised Him from the dead, then you shall be saved. The short, summary content of the Christian faith & confession, as also of the apostolic proclamation, is $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ "Jesus der Herr." In his appellations *ex summa fidei et salutis* Bengel. $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, "Herr," Lord, here means Jesus "as the perfect Mediator of salvation & even therefore, the originator of righteousness." Weiss. Compare the remarks made on the name $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in 1. 7. And that Jesus has become with His resurrection from the dead. Here too Paul adds the other object, that God had raised Him from the dead as he had shortly before already considered the death & resurrection of Christ. "To $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ mentions the facts of the salvation, thru which the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ of Jesus is mediated & which attest the fact that He is the Mediator of salvation & has procured the righteousness in His expiatory death." Weiss. And whoever now believes that from the heart & confesses with the mouth that Jesus is his Lord & Savior & that God has raised Him from the dead, shall certainly be saved, shall receive the future $\sigma\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha}$. For he takes & grasps in faith, which then proves itself in confession, Christ & the righteousness procured by Christ's death & sealed by Christ's resurrection, which guarantees the future salvation. In the second statement: "Es kommt also dem Menschen zu glauben mit dem Herzen, und mit dem Munde bekennen man zur Heiligkeit." ("For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; & with the mouth confession is made unto salvation"), v. 10, the $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ are stressed. It is faith of the heart which attains to righteousness & confession of the mouth which attains to salvation. It is sufficient, that is the meaning, as also Hofmann has set it in light, - it is sufficient that one believes with the heart & confesses with the mouth, in order to be justified & saved, & there is no need of any active endeavor.

striking on the part of man. For the faith of the heart, which witnesses to a confession of the mouth, signifies chiefly the righteousness present in Christ, which has salvational as an unending result, & makes the same a personal, inner possession. Here also the parallelism *membrorum*, as it is displayed in the L. H. passages, is decisive for the form of representation & brings with itself that Paul together with the *supplices* also mentions the *δικαιοσύνη* expressly & ascribes the latter to the *πίστις*, the former to the *ἑξομολογία*. Very correctly Hofmann remarks: "Therefore neither as *πίστις* would be meant which can remain outside the *ἑξομολογία*, nor as *δικαιοσύνη* which can remain outside the *supplices*. The confession is in the faith, which redounds to righteousness, & faith is in the confession which redounds to salvation, & even so the salvation, which receives the righteousness, is in the righteousness, & the righteousness, which is in its hypothesis, is considered together in the salvation. The heart & mouth, so faith & confession are together & the inwardness of faith corresponds to the invisible righteousness of the believers & the openness of the confession corresponds to the visible righteousness of the believers, evident procurement of salvation in the righteous ones who shall finally be glorified. Righteousness & salvation is everything that we need, and everything that does us harm in order to receive them is a twofold thing, which is so naturally together, like heart & mouth, thought & speech, namely that we believe with the heart that which is placed in our heart, and confess with our mouth that which is placed into our mouth."

Still these remarks need a supplement. One does not misunderstand this comparison of faith and confession, as is oftentimes the case, as the same relationship to becoming righteous & becoming justified. It is faith alone which justifies & saves man. It is faith alone which lays hold on Christ & the righteousness concluded in Christ, & only in that which faith lays hold of, is the object of faith, lies the *visus*, *fructus* & *salvatio*. The confession of the mouth is, on the other hand, a fruit & work of faith & has itself nothing to do with the apprehension of Christ. But above all, the confession follows entirely of itself, of necessity out of faith. Heart & mouth are side by side. What to say the heart is full, of what the mouth overflows, is known from the heart. Whoever in Jesus Christ his Lord & Savior, cannot do anything else, he must confess Christ also outwardly, with the mouth, before God & man. A heart which is entirely silent concerning Christ, which at the same time knows nothing concerning Christ. And so the confession of the mouth is proof for the fact that faith dwells in the heart, & proof of the true, living faith. And only the faith of the heart, only the true, living faith, not a dead faith, only the *verus* and *vivus*, not the *fictus* & *factus*, really grasps & lays hold of Christ & makes him his own. Only the faith of the heart, only the true living faith justifies & saves man. Even therefore, because the confession of the mouth is a proof of the faith of the heart, of the true, living faith, can one also correctly say, that the faith which confesses, which progresses to confession of the mouth, justifies & saves man; certainly not insofar as he confesses, but only insofar as he really & actually lays hold of Christ. The justifying, saving faith has then form & nature, that it then shows its power also in confession, that it is a powerful & living thing. And finally, as Paul does in our text, even because faith & confession, heart & mouth are so closely together, because the

speech of the mouth flows out of the heart & conforms the disposition of the heart, one can grammatically coordinate the faith of the heart & the confession of the mouth with one another & ~~express~~ express one.

self same, that faith & confession render a man's righteousness & salvation. Melancthon remarks on Rom. 10: 10: Paulus autem sic loquitur one sit confessio ad salutem, aut testis, i.e. require non by, poenitentiam, sed vivam et eternam fidem. And in the Catechism it reads: Quum Paulus inquit (Rom. 10, 10): Verbe credideris ad justitiam, ore sit confessio ad salutem. His satis adversarius existimamus, quod confessio ex opere operato non justificet aut salvet, sed tantum propter fidem cordis. Et Paulus sic loquitur quod confessio salvet, ut a iudice, qualis fides confitetur vitam eternam, nemo firmus et efficax fides. Musell, Symbol. 83. p. 155.

Finally it is still pointed out that in the foregoing section, v. 19, involves the righteousness of faith being new with respect to the old law & the new dispensation of justification & the decision concept "richly full", "riches", "full", "full" are arranged just so & are placed in the same relation to each other as the same in the new dispensation & in the Law, 2, 1-3, 21. The righteousness, in which alone the sinner can stand before God, the righteousness which avails before God, & thus the final salvation as a consequence, appears also here as a ready power & gift, which is procured and sealed thru Christ's death & resurrection, offered to man in the Word & is taken hold of & grasped in faith, so that whoever believes the Word appears before God as a righteous one & in the future, shall certainly be saved. Also in our passage the Gospel states the righteousness of faith, that means the righteousness which would be taken in faith, in contrast to the righteousness of the Law, in which everything depends on the action of man, & now here he reminds his readers especially how God has brought salvation nearer to man in Christ, in the Word of faith, which eternally remains far away and unattainable to him who seeks to gain it by works. And now that there is a somewhat of a misunderstanding about a great and unexpressed idea, which is unexpressed it is unexpressed now still, because namely with works, which never lead to the goal & rather from himself, the salvation which is sought to ^{win}.

That faith saves the Epistle confirms with a quotation of Scripture, thru the already quoted 2, 331, with known dictum of Isaiah 55: 1. Whomsoever in Him, that is, in Christ, trusts & trusts there, shall not come to shame, shall not be disappointed. Only faith that is mentioned there, not the confession. Still faith also, as we have shown previously, is decision, action. Nevertheless Paul does not write there simply: "Ο πιστεύς ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἔσται σωτηρία." This is the words which in the Septuagint in the Hebrew text, shall be understood as unlimited & πᾶν ἔσται σωτηρία. And the Epistle would be coming into prominence the factor of the universality. Bengel: Hoc monum. labor, πᾶν ἔσται σωτηρία, note

modo positum, propositum v. 11, the repetitum v. 12 et 13, the conformatio alterius v. 14. 15, ut non modo significat, quicunque invocavit, salvam fore; sed et eum velle, se invocari ab omnibus salutariis. The interpretation of Isaiah 7:18 & 7:19 through 7:25 & 7:26 is the same as the Greek justifies in v. 12. with the remark that between Jew & Greek there is no difference. It makes no difference whether the believer is a Greek or a Jew. Deum Simundemelle ist Herr aller ("for the same Lord (is) over all"), v. 12; namely, according to the content, all believers. Christ is here called κύριος. Also here the κύριος pp. as in v. 9, includes Christ's mediators of salvation, as it appears from the oppositional clause (Weis): "rich," "riches," πλούσιος, for or over against all who call upon him. The emphasis also here lies on the concept. τίς, or τίς τούτος and τίς τούτος. Christ is the Lord & Savior of all believers, rich enough to help all to salvation who call upon him. Therefore there is no difference here between Jew & Greek. Therefore everyone who believes in him shall be saved. At the close of v. 12 Paul speaks of appealing. What is the direct proof of faith. But now he also shows proof for the statement, that the Lord is rich in salvation & help over against all who call upon him, with a word of Scripture, namely, Jer 3:5 (cf. v. 2, 3). There it reads: "Jeder, der den Namen des Herrn Jehovas anrufen wird, der wird errettet werden". "Whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered". Correctly Paul refers the calling on the name of Jehovah to the calling on the name of Christ, the Lord, since certainly Christ is the Lord Jehovah. The characteristic "Jeder," "whoever," is also found in the dictum of Jer. As for the rest, this O. T. quotation expresses sufficiently what is likewise understood of itself, that calling upon the name of the Lord Christ is the very same thing as praying. The Christians call upon & pray to Christ as their Lord & God. Christ, our Lord & Savior, is also simply & κύριος. It is very obvious, how also this last section, v. 11-13, which forms a kind of supplement to the foregoing, v. 1-10, serves the principal purpose of the entire compilation begun in 9:30. Everyone who believes & calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, be he Greek or Jew. "to everyone, even to the Jew, God has brought salvation some." If the Jew would only call upon the name of the Lord, then they would be saved. There-fore how heavily weighs the guilt of their unbelief!

10.14.15.

With the resumptive οὕτως the apostle again takes up the 3:11-12 & 13, and adds a series of questions, in which he brings to expression what the calling on the name of the Lord presupposes. The conjunctives 3:11-12-13 & 14, 15 & 16, 17 & 18, 19 & 20 are predominantly attested, even by the oldest codices. And it also 3:21 & 22 is to be read in the third part. It is the conjunctive deliberative. The future, which in other manuscripts older, is the so-called future of ethical necessity. It makes no difference for the sense, whether it reads: "Now shall they call upon, or: Now can they call upon, if they do not believe." The meaning in both cases is that the one cannot take place without the other. Therefore the first question reads thus: "Wie sollen sie nun anrufen, an welchen, sie nicht glauben?", really: "nicht glaubig geworden sind", 3:21 & 22 & 23.

Another recapitulation in addition to No. 52, 1, which he had amplified in v. 4, 15, the connection between faith preaching, & sending. Still this recapitulation is no mere tautology, but added on to ward to place into him more & bring light the unbelieving, the disobedience of the few. These with their unbelief oppose this content, the ordinance & salvation established by God & frustrate what God has done & prepared in order to bring man to salvation.

"Aber ich sage: Haben sie es nicht gehört?" ("But I say, Have they not heard?") v. 18. That is an objection which the Apostle himself raises. Ἄν' οὐκ ἤκουσαν; The οὐκ is to be taken strictly with ἤκουσαν. The meaning is: Nothing has remained inaudible to them. The object of ἤκουσαν, of which Paul thinks, is according to the context the message concerning Christ; the subjects are, as previously, those who have remained unbelievers, the unbelieving Jews. Now in the foregoing, where the Apostle had criticized the unbelief, the disobedience of the Jews, he had presumed as self-evident that these Jews had heard the report concerning Christ, the voice of the messengers of God. One can only expect faith among those who have received the preaching. Disobedience even against the Gospel one can make into an excuse only to those into whose ears the Gospel has come. Thus one sees even of the Apostle's own objection can be, whether he had not presumed too much in the foregoing, whether all the Jews had really heard the Gospel, whether some of the original

the reputation of Caesar Augustus, is designated as *παρὰ τὸν οἶκον* ἐν ἡ. And in Rom. 1, 8 Paul had attested concerning the faith of the Roman Christians, that it was made known in the whole world ἐν ἡ. τὸν οἶκον. Now, and the preaching of the Gospel succeeded in the same way, but even to this letter, that the name of Christ was known in the known world, in all parts of the Roman Empire. But then certainly it had also not remained unknown to the Jews of the Diaspora. And so the Jews cannot excuse their unbelief by the fact that they have not heard it. Rodet: "The voices of the preachers of the Gospel have sounded in all lands & in all cities of the known world. No synagogue which had not been filled with it, no Jew in the world who could with right set up his ignorance in these things as an excuse."

The Epistle had cut off all excuse from the unbelief of the Jews. Also this, that they had not heard it. The messengers or heralds had gone after them even to the ends of the earth. And now he continues: *Ἥλιος δὲ ὡς ἡ γῆ γινώσκει τὸν ἔθνον*; 10, 17. "Wie ich sage: Hat es Israel nicht erfahren?" ("But say, Did not Israel know?"). What the sense? The purpose of this question is, on that the thoughts of the expositors are completely at variance. It is first of all to be remarked that from the mention of the subject, Israel, it in no way presents itself that previously the discussion must have been concerning the Gentiles. That would run contrary to the context of the entire presentation from 9, 30 on. For there there out Paul has to do with the Jews, with the unbelief of the Jews. Where he turns to the Gentiles, or the "ends of the Gentiles," he does it only with the purpose of illustrating the conduct of the Jews from the contrast. The naming of the subject, & certainly with the honorable name of Israel, explains itself from the tendency of the question. Above all the question arises now, which object of ἔθνον the Apostle has in mind. But with that the other question hangs together, how the ἔθνον itself is to be understood. So most numbers of expositors, for example, Kalov, Kistner, de Wette, Hagenmüller, Tholuck, Ewald, Meyer & Rodet, supply either out of the foregoing or out of the following Scripture quotation "the universal designation of the preaching of Christ," resp. "that the Gospel would pass over from the Jews to the Gentiles," take ἔθνον in the sense of "Erkennung" (come to know), "Erkenntnis" (recognition), & admit the Apostle is denying that the universality of the Gospel had remained unknown to the Jews. If that were so, then he would here diverge from his theme. For that is not the real characteristic of the unbelief of the Jews, that they specially know the real designation of the Gospel as to the Gentiles, but do not acknowledge it. And as it is a matter known to the Jews, much rather had really come might to them according to the entire implication the Gospel itself, the preaching of Christ. And even this mode of their unbelief is excusable. Thus others explain, for example, Hengstenberg, Keck, Philippi, Hofmann, Scharf & Scharf, in connection with the context maintain a name ἔθνον, or ἔθνη, as for the preaching, or even a name, ἔθνη, as for the report of Christ, the Gospel. Hence, for example, Hofmann, suppose the Apostle here, just as much as Israel had not received the preaching of Christ, was precisely he had denied him of the Gentiles. At any point the

come out over against Israel, in that he sought to soften the hard hearts through his winning preaching of the Gospel: "For the vessels of wrath waits execution. But the Jews degraded the riches of the divine goodness, patience & long suffering & declared, frankly & freely: We would not. We would not be saved. And that again to the unbeliever was all time. 'See, what an abyss of wickedness we dig! Still he! No lost, condemned man comes the eternal mercy, the open arms of love of him, who bows down to sinners, to whom the heart always breaks, we come or do not come. And man, secretly withdrawing himself, from the loving arms of God & speaks to God: No, I would not entrust myself to you & do not need you. From this description of unbelief it now also becomes evident how far Isaiah & with him the Gospel, who makes the words of Isaiah his own, speak boldly. Namely, as far as he once shamed the Jews through the example of the Gentiles, & then exposed the unbelief of the Jews in all its shame & abomination.

The uniform content of the 12. chapter, resp. the amplification in 7, 20-21, is very clear. The Apostle here treats of the cause of the rejection of Israel, which he had announced in the 7. chapter & shows that it lies in man, & now describes in the example of the Jews, as it were, expressly, the unbelief and hardly conceivable, as an entirely inexcusable guilt of man. What he says in this connection concerning faults, the conversion & pardoning of the Gentiles, serves only to brand more sharply the unbelief of the Jews. Unbelief is disobedience over against the Gospel, the message of salvation, despising & disdaining of the salvation, which has come might to man in the Gospel, in belief & in action over against the ordinance of salvation, wanting want of appreciation of the righteousness merited by Christ & offered in the Gospel, & in man in Christ, the various sins, anti-godly over against the grace of God, & sinfulness is contradiction against the doctrine of grace & patience, who have no more returned to deliver man from sin. man, he can now perhaps the content of the entire section, 7, 20 to 19, 21, in the statement.

The Apostle laments the fact with grief that, while the Gentiles have received the righteousness of faith, Israel has not become obedient to the Gospel, but has cast, & thus lost the salvation which has come so might to all.

But now still a word concerning the relationship of the 12. chapter to the 7. chapter. This question has given the expositors much to do. One designates the difference between the mutual statements of the two chapters, variously to the fact that salvation's disdaining, disobedience, condemnation in the 7. chapter are made dependent upon the absolute will of God, in the 12. chapter on the conduct, the free self-determination of man. And now one has given oneself much trouble to bring these different expressions into harmony. Some, as, for example, Meyer & others, present the matter so, that the Apostle's different ways of thinking; what Paul says in the 7. chapter concerning the absolute sovereignty of God is a principle of action, which is motivated by the conscience against the Jewish arrogance, & which then in the 12. chapter is placed at the side of the practical way of thinking, which concedes to human freedom's self-determination.

their proper right. But with such "abstraction" one decides himself's others. If one also once in contrast to a decided error emphasizes a decided truth & thereby looks away from & abstracts other truths then one can still never directly contradict what one says on the one side of truth with what the other side of truth holds in itself. Otherwise out of the abstraction there comes an obvious self-contradiction, and the truth is broken entirely. And so it comes to stand in this case, when with the above designation of the difference of the two chapters it is true that salvation & disaster in the first part are traced back to the absolute will, the absolute predestination of God in the second to the conduct, the self-determination of man. If it is really in that, that in the 9. chapter Paul permits the hardening, rejection & condemnation of the Jews to be established in an absolute, divine decree of rejection, then that which he teaches in the 10. chapter concerning the cause of the rejection of Israel, concerning the unwilling of the Jews contradicts that. If it is really in that, that Paul in the 10. chapter makes the faith, conversion & ordering of the Gentiles dependent upon their self-determination, then that contradicts that which he had taught in the 9. chapter of the sovereignty of the divine grace. If it is really in that, that in both chapters Paul traces salvation & disaster back to a uniform principle, the one time to the absolute will of God, the other time to the moral conduct of man, then Becks, Kocimer, Haebl, & Fritzsch are correct, when they accept that Paul has permitted himself to be drawn into self-contradiction by the dialectic, *grati. Melius ubi Paulus concessit, ut Augustinus, non diametricis obliuimus, quare. Fritzsch.* The entire dilemma, however, rests on a false exegesis, on willful, permitted conclusions & reflections of the exegetes. What Paul really teaches in the 9. chapter & what he really teaches in the 10. chapter, agree very well with one another. We have proven above, that Paul in that which he says in the 9. chapter concerning the hardening, rejection & condemnation of Israel also presumes that Israel had incurred their own sentence with their striving against God's Word & work, that hardening presupposes self-obduracy; that what he states concerning the sentence passed on the Jews is, in reality, includes initially the general, gracious will of God; that Paul knows nothing of any absolute decree of rejection of God, as Weiss also has brought this to light. And that which he had already pointed out in short in the 9. chapter with regard to the guilt, the unwilling of the Jews, he then carries out, further in the 10. chapter. In the 9. chapter Paul stresses the sovereignty of the divine grace, that God is gracious to whom He will & gracious, that faith, conversion & salvation are in no way dependent upon the willing & walking, on the conduct of man, but entirely upon God's grace. But we find the same thing stated in the 10. chapter, where it is attested that the Gentiles without their running & assistance have received the righteousness of God that the Gentiles without their seeking God & asking after Him have found Him. But when the Apostle says in the 9. chapter concerning the will of God, which is hidden from us, concerning the mystery of the divine dispensation, that God has mercy on whom He will have mercy, & will have mercy on whom He will, he, as we have shown above, upon an entirely different point & does not stand in any contradiction with the two other options: the self-salvation lies in God alone, their condemnation, however, in themselves.

Chapter VI.

Vi. 1-11. God has not rejected His people.

Vi. 1-22.

The historical amplification begins in 8:1-4, and a conclusion, for the rest in 19:21. The earlier had established beyond doubt that the people, Israel, have been separated from God, shut out from the nation in Christ, & the basis for this rejection, the Jews is given, that is, their persistent unbelief. To these principles thoughts of the two previous chapters he now goes back, in that he begins his discourse anew, & raises the question: Αἰὶν οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Ἀδὲν οὐκ οὐ; Vi. 1. Ἡ δὲ ἀποκρίσις is the later form for ἀντίθεσις. "Schlage nun: Gott hat doch sein Volk nicht verworfen!" ("Say then, But God can't away His people!") That would say: What I have written concerning the rejection of the Jews is still not meant so, as if God had rejected His people. For "therefore it deals here, as one has seen it, with that which Israel has experienced." *Wirkmann*. *Quod Paulus de objectione Iudeorum dixit et contritute prophetica comprobavit, hoc nunc explicat et interpretatur, quomodo sit intelligendum*. Paul has formulated the question so, that he permits it to be known beforehand, that he would know it to be denied. That is shown already by the 19:21 at the head. And the two concepts ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἔστιν οὐ and τὸν Ἀδὲν οὐκ οὐ exclude one another. That would be a self-contradiction, if God would reject His people, His own people. That would be an inconceivable as if anyone would hate his own flesh, *ipse equum ejusque speculationem rationum negandi continet*. Bengel. The discussion here is not concerning the Jewish nation as such & the historical salutary calling of Israel, as many expositors take it, so that the meaning would be, whether the latter would fall together somewhat with the rejection of some tribes or the majority of Israelites. For condemnation (*Verwerfung*) is as much as rejection (*Verwerfung*), exclusion from salvation, & something else, as one of the historical salutary calling. The expression ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ οὐ, & ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ οὐ has its full meaning & designates the people of God in the narrow sense of the word. Already in 9:7-8 Paul had differentiated between the Israel κατὰ σαρκα and the Israel κατὰ πνεῦμα, between the Israelites who stemmed from Abraham only according to the flesh & the children of God from among Jews, the children of the promise, whom God had chosen & called to adoption & to eternal life. & restricts what he had said concerning the rejection of Israel to the former. This difference he would now amplify further. The people of God, of whom he speaks in 11:1, are the sons of that ἑνὸς Θεοῦ, 9:3, of the true children of God are "God's people in Israel." *Müller*. And it is still inconceivable that God should have rejected this, as he has. Thus Pauline now expressly and energetically denies the question raised by himself with 19:21. "Heu re, re, re!" ("God, forbid!"), so, *quia* this denial, but of itself is not proof of his own reason. It is certainly aimed at Israelites, at the seed of Abraham, of the tribes of Benjamin, Ephraim, & all the tribes of Israel. For the two tribes of Ephraim & Benjamin after the return of the Jews were the kernel of the Jewish nation. And the servants of

apostle of Jesus Christ has self-evidently become partaker of the salvation in Christ & thus with his example gives proof for the fact that there are Israelites who are saved, that there is in Israel a people, whom God has not rejected.

The Apollos repeats his statement in v. 22, only in another form: $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$ ("God has not cast away his people"). In that he adds the words: $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$ the meaning, since this relative clause should restrict the concept $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$ is already justified by the correct interpretation of its latter. Paul would evidently wish the additional clause only call to attention more strongly the fact, how inconceivable it is, that God should have rejected His own people, & establish the $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$ etc. But certainly the $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$ must be correctly understood. Ancient and modern exegesis here also, as in 7:27, point to the divine, irrevocable decree. Calvin & contemporary theologians here also say: $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$; $\text{populum suum, quem crediditum praevidebat}$. Still this is absolutely untenable. The reader must then, as already remarked above, think of the principle matter out of his own self. And in the irrevocable decree of God there has been no motive for the non-rejection. For God's previous knowledge points to that which happens in time to the conduct of man. If the persons of whom the Apollos speaks here had not sinned, then God would also have known that beforehand & would have rejected them. Just as arbitrary

is contrary to the context in the supplement which the modern exegesis, as, for example, Meyer and Hilgenfeldt add to $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$: "non uellemus ut voras gentes, daretur eis in vultu eis et biberentur eis." But this is exactly against this: " $\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἔρριψεν τὸν λαόν σου}$ " means nothing further, than that God had seen before-hand that this people would be His people. Therefore there is here no basis over against the possibility of their rejection. For He could then also have foreseen, that when they would cease to be His people, they would dis-continue. It is inconceivable that God had rejected them only then, when God's, irrevocable decree had previously made Israel (more exactly: those people in Israel) into that which they afterwards became in reality. Certainly, in v. 22, v. 23 here also, as in 7:27, has sense & understanding only then, when, wholly apart of the will of God is designated, "ein anhängendes Erkennen," Galbardi, Lange. Already previously, already from eternity, God had chosen, had acknowledged His people, in His eternal counsel & decree. He had made them His possession. And therefore the later rejection of this people of His is a thing of impossibility. For God is not as man, that He should then cast away from Himself again those whom He had previously chosen, whom He had selected & accepted, that He should them again permit to fall what He had decreed and predestinated.

That God has not rejected His people is based on the fact that God had chosen them in advance as a possession, & is confirmed by the example of Paul, who certainly also was an Israelite, viz. further confirmed

by the fact that at all times there had been remnant in Israel which was saved. The Christian reader knows very well, v. 2 b; what the scriptures say of S. Ias, that is in the part of the Book of the Kings - (which treat of S. Ias, how S. Ias went to God against Israel, how he accused Israel before God: "Worry sie haben deine Propheten getödtet, deine Altäre umgeworfen, und ich bin allein übrig geblieben"; not only of the prophets, but also of the worshippers of God, und ich treibeten mir nach dem Leben.") ("Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; & I am left alone, & they seek my life"). V. 3. The latter point applied especially to the godless regal pair, Abak & Jezebel; Regarding the destruction of the altars S. Ias remarks: Verisimile est, si iam loquar de altaribus quae parum in excelsis studio quodam pietatis deo vero erecta fuerant; maxime postquam decem tribus regum suorum tyrannide prohibita fuerunt, ne iherosolimam accenserent sacrificii causa. Quamvis enim id lege melitum esset ac recte fecerint. Ezechias et osias, reges iudae, etiam ejusmodi aras evolvende, tamen im-
pium erat eas subvertere odio civitas &c israel. "Abur was castelm aer b'puch, tollu?" ("But what raildest thou answer of God unto him"), &c. x p q u x r s w o? v. 4. Now does the division answer read: Ich habe mir übrig gelassen sieben tausend Mann, der ihre Knie nicht gebeugt haben vor Baal ("I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal"), 77, 8ax i.
Baalis or Belarte. In that time of general apostasy & of religious persecution God had cho-
sen for Himself a group of faithful servants & protected them against apostasy. And so also now in the present time, v. 5 in the time of the race so displacement & adversity of Israel, there has been a remainder
of a remnant saint. Holy one, v. 6 v. 7. Then are we believing & reading, we have given honor to Christ &
to the Father of Jesus Christ who have entered into Church of Christ. But that such a remnant has remained
has taken place in consequence of the election of grace, not of works, v. 9, become a work as chosen, or
himself these remaining over out of the multitude of the nation of grace, & at last should come back here
of salvation. And now in v. 6 the Apostle clarifies the position on the concept of grace & shows that grace ex-
cludes all regard to the works & conduct of man. Et sic videtur, ut hunc per se non, sed etiam etiam
"Weiss aber aus Gnade, dann nicht mehr aus dem Leben, weil sonst die Gnade nicht mehr Gnade ist"
("And by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace"). Grace is not of grace,
when one considers in with it the works & conduct of man. And the election of grace is not to be an election of
grace, when God has in any manner taken into consideration in his election the conduct of man. August-
ine: Gratia nisi gratis sit, qualis non est. Non est gratia illo modo, si non sit gratuita omni modo. The
following sentence: Et sic etiam epovv, euketi eti pipis, etoi ro epovv euketi etiv epovv,
which is lacking in most codices, certainly as a variant in B and C, it is genuine, taken together with the
proceeding, brings very strongly to expression that grace & works mutually exclude each other. "Look
in no way upon, when the discussion comes to be of grace, because a work which does not acquire itself"
what its result is, is no more an actual performance. "Nemo. Ti oou; v. 8. "Hic sum?" ("Ist das ich?") Ist das

follows from this? How does the situation stand? That, for which the great majority in Israel stood, namely, after righteousness & salvation they had not received, because they would be justified and saved by works. "Die Sichel hat es aber erlangt", but the election has obtained it", $\eta \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \eta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu$. Here $\epsilon \nu \alpha \gamma \gamma \eta$ is abstraction pro concretis. The elect, who owe their existence & their conditions solely to the free grace of God, have received it. Thus there is, stand in Israel also to true people of God, whom God has not rejected, has not cast away, but who are partakers of the salvation in Christ.

11, 2b-10.

Now the Apostle again calls special attention to the contrast. $\text{Οι δε λοιποι εσονται ος 2754 v. 11, 2b.}$ "Die Ubrigem aber, und diese sind die rest of them, sind verhärtet worden" ("and the rest were blinded"). το 3 v means "verhärten" harden, indurate, from $\tau \alpha \upsilon \rho \alpha \varsigma$, "Tuffstein", tuffaceous limestone, hardening, & is a synonym of $\epsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \acute{\upsilon} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, 7, 18. This understanding & will have become dull & hard, entirely insensible and unimpressible for the salvation in Christ, for the Word of salvation. Already in the above amplification on obduracy, 7, 17, which was conducted more objectively, Paul had the Jews in mind. Now, after he had portrayed the guilt, the unbelief of Israel in extremis, he testifies to Israel directly that they have, after under the judgment of obduracy of God as a punishment for their unbelief Weiss: "They are hardened by God, that means, so firmly set in the perverted course which they took, that they have been made insensible for all impulses for the changing of the same. Therefore their perverted course is thus not traced back to this hardening, but, turned around, their hardening is laid down as a judgment of punishment upon the perverted course taken, in which they must now continue, after they have not wanted to leave the same." But no one should be surprised over this severe destiny of the Jews. For it is already foretold by the prophets: $\text{α 2 3 v. 1 ε 3 πα 2 α, etc.}$ And thus the Apostle now introduces several prophetic statements. First of all, 1. 2a, a short statement from the prophecy of Isaiah, 29, 9-10, which, as it were, deals ex professo with the obduracy of Israel. Hitzig's translates & gives the exegesis: "The 7 v 10 v is there, but the 7 1 2 is lacking, & all the 7 2 10 v 7 2 7 points to the stupidity of the multitude. Therefore the prophet to whom the unhappy race has come to harden his people, must cry out in 9a: 'Hitzig nur und glosset, verblendet euch und es blindet!' ... They do not know to bind themselves in God's Word, they are confused & their eyes are as if swollen shut. Then this condition, brought on by their own guilt, is the condition willed upon them by God as punishment. The imperatives are judicial words of emphasis. This heightening of the self-obduracy is the judgment of obduracy the prophet prophesies in 9b, 12: 'Trunken sind sie und nicht Weiss, taumeln und nicht von Wein. Sie sind ausgegossen bei ihren eckel, jedoch ist kein Wechdel und ist verbunden eure Augen, die Propheten und eure Häupter, die Seher, hat es umschweert. Und es wird euch die Offenbarung von dem allen wie zu Worten einer versiegelten Schrift, welche man hingibt

them") is presented as a fact. Certainly, now, those Jews who turned to Christ did not belong to the obdurate Jews. They were at first really unbelieving, still their unbelief had not advanced even to self-obduracy & hardening. The note is immensely prized, when one refers it even to those individuals concerning whom it was formerly said that they have stumbled & fallen. Then one must accept that all hardened Jews of all times have turned to the Lord or shall be converted. We cannot forget that in the entire historical discussion in chap. 7-11 that there is a difference between Israel & Israel, between the unbelieving Israelites, who are hardened & are rejected forever because of their unbelief & the remnant whom God has chosen, the people of God in Israel, whom God had chosen for Himself beforehand. And the one part, like the other, is also designated simply as "Israel," "they, the Jews." (on the one hand 9:31; 19:10; 9:21; on the other hand, 9:6ff.) In our passage, however, in the sections, 11, 11-15 the Jews are set over against the Gentiles in genera. These are thus according to the genus the same people, these are the Israelites, the Jews who have stumbled & fallen, & who attracted by the Gentiles, have turned to Christ but they are not here & there the same Jewish individuals. What individuals are meant here & there is pointed out by the content & by the complete distinction of the opposites.

By means of a $\Sigma \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \epsilon \tau \alpha \kappa \acute{o} \varsigma$ this epistle adds a further expression with regard to the solitary result of the fall of Israel. $\Sigma \iota \Sigma \epsilon \tau \acute{o} \kappa \alpha \rho \acute{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \alpha \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \nu \tau \eta \lambda \omicron \upsilon \tau \omicron \varsigma \kappa \acute{\iota} \sigma \mu \omicron \varsigma \kappa \alpha \iota \tau \acute{o} \xi \epsilon \tau \eta \omega \alpha \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \nu \tau \eta \lambda \omicron \upsilon \tau \omicron \varsigma \epsilon \theta \nu \omega \nu \kappa \acute{o} \varsigma \omega \nu \omega \mu \acute{\iota} \lambda \omicron \varsigma \tau \acute{o} \tau \eta \xi \eta \mu \omega \alpha \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \nu$; 11. 2. "Nun aber ihr Vergehen der Welt Reichtum ist und ihr Schaden der Heiden Reichtum, wie viel mehr ihr Vollzahl!" ("Now if the fall of them is the riches of the world & the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness?"). In the protasis Paul again takes up the content of the foregoing statement, in order to draw a deduction from it. Together with the $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha$ of the Jews, he has meant $\epsilon \nu \tau \acute{o} \xi \epsilon \tau \eta \omega \alpha \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \nu$ "in latter expression sig. riches not 'diminishing' (minority), but as in 1 Cor. 9: 7, the same as the classical $\xi \tau \eta \alpha$, namely, 'Niederlage' (overthrow), 'Verlust' (loss), 'Schaden' (injury). The harm is meant which the Jews have brought down upon themselves with their unbelief. The diminishing, the harm of the Jews is the riches of the world or of the Gentiles, the latter is present with the former in that as a result of the unbelief's harm of the Jews, a fulness of salvation & of grace, the entire riches of Christ, has fallen to the Gentile world. But if this is the case, $\kappa \acute{o} \varsigma \omega \nu \omega \mu \acute{\iota} \lambda \omicron \varsigma \tau \acute{o} \tau \eta \xi \eta \mu \omega \alpha \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \nu$, how much more, how much rather shall their riches (being salvation's blessing to the world. $\tau \eta \xi \eta \mu \omega \alpha$ means, as $\tau \eta \xi \eta \mu \omega \alpha$ first of all has shown in detail, id. quare, impletio the contents of, vessel, that which fills up, the fulness, full measure, thus in Eph. 1: 23 $\tau \acute{o} \tau \eta \xi \eta \mu \omega \alpha \tau \omega \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \alpha \nu$, the full measure, the times; when persons are the subject of discussion, then the full measure is as much as the full number. In this most expressive expression $\tau \eta \xi \eta \mu \omega \alpha \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \theta \nu \omega \nu$ in 11: 25 designates the full number of the Gentiles. With this full number of the Jews, however, is not meant the total number of all the Jews who stem from Abraham according to the flesh. In our passage, looking away from the activity of the thought to the content & to the

away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"

v. 15. The thought of the 12. verse again comes to expression here, only in another form. ἡ ἀποδοχή signifies here, as throughout in profane Greek, & as the ἀποδοχή in Mark 10, 53; Heb. 10, 35; 1 Tim. 4, 4, "accepting" (casting away), "rejection" (rejection), but the rejection of the Jews, the reconciliation of the Jews was established & given. The reconciliation, which is caused by the unbeliever's & the resulting rejection of the Jews, is not the objective reconciliation of the world with God through Christ's blood and death, but the subjective reconciliation, concerning which the discussion is, for example also in 1 Cor. 5, 20: "Be ye reconciled to God", is identical with the conversion of the Gentile world to God. As a result of the rejection of Israel the word of reconciliation has entered into the Gentile world & has translated many Gentiles into the right relationship of peace to God & has led them into the communion of God. But now, after the rejection of Israel, this terrible thing, has had such a good result & effect, what blessing shall then, Israel, have out of the acceptance of Israel? ἡ ἀποδοχή corresponds with the ἀποδοχή in v. 14. It is correlated to the ἀποδοχή & thus concerns the Jews, who belong to the ἀποδοχή , to the true people of God out of Israel, whom God had chosen for Himself from the beginning. ἡ ἀποδοχή is the opposite of ἀποδοχή . As little as all Jews were rejected, just as little shall all Jews be

accepted. And now, when the ἀποδοχή is fulfilled, i.e., when all the remnants out of Israel, whom God has chosen for Himself from the beginning until His act, have been won, for Christ & have been reconciled to God by God, then follows the blessed, glorious end. And that is nothing else than the life out of death. With that there cannot possibly be meant a spiritual re-entrainment; for such a thing would fall together with the reconciliation of the world & the progression of the discourse would then be broken & the last stage of the development of the Kingdom of God would not even be mentioned. But an official "golden age of the Church, Jews Christ on earth", dreamed up, & expanded by the Church & its sects, is completely read into the text. ἡ ἀποδοχή in v. 15, as the break church fathers & most of the modern expositors have correctly acknowledged, is the blessed, glorious life, which begins with the resurrection of the dead, that is which Paul has presented in 5, 11 as the final result of the justification & reconciliation. When the preaching of the Gospel has attained its purpose in the Gentile world & in Israel, when the ἐκδοχή out of the Gentile nations & the ἐκδοχή out of Israel is reconciled & has entered into the communion of God, then the time of the world is passed, then a new life & scene shall take effect, the life of glory, then shall the converted Jews & Gentiles inherit the Kingdom, which has been prepared for them from the foundation of the world.

When we clearly look back to the last two sections, 11, 11-12 and 11, 13-15, then we find in both the same sequence of thought: The side of the Jews, their unbelief & their rejection were for the salvation, for the conversion of the Gentiles; the faith of the Gentiles, on the other hand, was for the conversion & deliverance of Israel, some out of Israel, the adoption, the inclusion of Israel, however, finally, for the rejection of

sensations, for die out of the dead. Only that in the second section the Lord speaks of himself & of his apostles & there shows how he helps to carry out that salutary purpose of God, vv. 11, 12, through his service in the Gospel, & that applies generally to his service in the Word. And so this latter amplification, introduced with *pag. vi. 12* & *comes*, is in confirmation of that which is said previously, remarked in general concerning the wonderful ways of God. The works & duties of Paul & in general of the N.T. preachers, it is to be known significantly what God has aimed at with the Jews & Gentiles & how God's purpose is carried out.

The above sketched outline of the development in the Kingdom of God leads us, also looking away from the contrast between Jews & Gentiles, into the history of the Church of Christ. That is & remains a lamentable fact, in which nothing shall change until the last day, that many, yes, the most of those who hear the Gospel do not believe the Gospel, continue in unbelief, & thus go down into condemnations. Nevertheless the Kingdom of God has its success on earth. God understands in a masterly manner how to still bring forth good out of this worst of all evils, unbelief, how to raise up others from the fall of one. It has already happened thus, that the Gospel, when it is driven from the one place by the unthankfulness of men, travels on farther, & gains a home, foothold in another place & thus brings forth much fruit. In this manner God's word has come from the Jews to the Gentiles, from the Greeks & Romans to the Germanic nations, out of the world into the new world. The persecutions of the Christians were means in God's hand for the spread of the Christian Church. Expelled Christians have taken their treasure, the riches of Christ, with them into exile & there have found open hearts. And the flourishing of faith in the distant & strange land has then often had a salutary reaction on the home church. The zeal of the newly converted preachers & are many, who have become idolaters or more easily die. For Christians preaching, however, it is an expected comfort, that they might say to the man with a, as Paul with his preaching to the Gentiles & the Jew & he preached also to the Jew, as he preached much, as I shall mention to the Jew, when they only faithfully carry out their office in their place on the earth entrusted to them, then they thereby create instruments through whom God then carries out his work of salvation on others. And as there are now many ways, through whom the elect, from all the ends & out of all the corners of the earth shall be brought together, through whom the Church of Christ shall be brought to its completion & perfection.

Summary: The fall of Israel serves only salutary purposes: the conversion of the Gentiles, the gathering of the elect out of Israel, the redemption of the Kingdom of God.

391.
11/16-24.

gentile Christians, a warning against pride & self-exaltation. What the Apostle had said previously concerning the fact that the Jews' rejection of the Jews had resulted in the salvation of the Gentiles could give occasion to the Christians from among the Gentiles, if they gave room to the flesh, to exalt themselves over against the Jews. And so the Apostle joins this warning or rebuke with the foregoing sections by means of the *ἡμεῖς καὶ οὐκ ἡμεῖς*.

The first sentence of this new section, 11:16, serves only as an introduction to the following. *Ἐὰν ᾖ ἡ ἀκροαμία ἁγία, καὶ τὸ ῥιζὺν καὶ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι*. "Wenn also der Unkraut heilig ist, so auch der Feig, und wenn die Lirge heilig ist, so sind es auch die Zweige." ("For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy; & if the root be holy, so are the branches"). *Ἀκροαμία* is here where the discussion is concerning the dough, a breaking of the dough, not the sheaves of the first fruits of the harvest. That Paul speaks of the firstfruits, the breaking of the dough, was occasioned by the stimulation of the Jews, according to which the firstfruits of the dough should be given to the priests. Num. 15:19-21. That the sheaves of the firstfruits of the new harvest were consecrated to the Lord in the sanctuary & thereby gave consecration to the entire harvest, does not come into consideration here. In reality, as Hofmann correctly remarks, there was & there is no holy breaking & no holy lump, as little

as there is a holy root & a holy branch. The predicate "holy" belongs to that which is portrayed with the breaking, lump, root & branches. The twofold image states only that the dough has the same quality as the breaking, the branches are of the same nature as the root. Only the second image, which is of the same sense with the first one, is firmly fixed in the following & further amplified. The expressions "root" and "branches" awaken the notion of a tree and thus the Apostle speaks, not of an olive tree, or a good, not a bad tree, to which in itself contrasts as wild olive tree. The olive tree is mainly an image of Israel, the latter a picture of the Gentile world. The roots of Israel, however, as most of the expositors have correctly acknowledged, are the pillars of Israel, the patriarchs, & these are themselves evidently meant with the breaking of the lump. That only root and branches are named specifically, not the trunk of the tree, too brings with itself the matter which is described here. In the following there is a differentiation made between Israelites & Israelites, & something different said of the one than of the other. With that alone does the mention of the branches fit in general in the entire section the picture of fact. The imaginative & the real expressions are closely knit together with one another.

But now in Israel as a whole, is the Jewish nation as such meant with the olive tree, resp. the lump? With the branches are all Israelites meant, who have descended from Abraham according to the flesh? And accordingly in the holiness, which Paul ascribes to the root as well as to the branches, only an external sanctity, a "sachliche" (substantial) holiness? These are the questions over which the expositors are in different minds. Some, like Salo, Meyer, Weiss & Philippi, answer these questions in the affirmative. More recently in the literature, as already remarked above in 9:1-9, also to the nation as a whole the title of the people of God was applied to Israel. Even to this people were conceded the prerogatives enumerated in 9:7. God

together with the engrafting of the branches of the wild olive tree, that is, with the conversion & bearing of the Gentiles. Thus Paul here thinks of that which was now happening, in his time, in the time of the 1st. With the appearance of Christ & the preaching of the Gospel a crisis had entered, for the believing Israelites. Many of those who had once believed Moses & the prophets now deceived themselves. They were offended in the crucified Christ, in the Word of the cross. And because of this unbelief of theirs, v. 6, they were broken off. They remained far from the Church of Christ & were thereby cut off from the olive tree & the root, from the bearing of the promise & communion of God, excluded from the congregation of God. For the congregation of God had now become the congregation of Jesus Christ. The Christian Church, which had its origin & beginning in Israel, was the genuine continuation of the Israel of the right kind. In Christ all the promises of God, which had been imparted to the fathers, in which all the believers of the Old Covenant had trusted, had become Yea and Amen. Therefore whoever of Israel had once received the promise, but then rejected the promised Redeemer, thereby ceased to be a real Israelite, a member of the congregation of God, of the congregation of Abraham. In the number of the unbelieving Jews certainly belonged also those children of Abraham according to the flesh, whose heart had always remained far from God, who had believed neither Moses nor the prophets, & now did not correctly believe in Jesus Christ & the preaching of the Apostles. From this species of unbelievers Paul turns away in the following context. Only the example of those Israelites who have shined from faith, as then also of those who after the apostasy are again converted & again received, like the purpose which he here pursues, the warning against apostasy, which he directs to the Gentile Christians.

The Apostle now takes one out of the number of the Gentile Christians & deals with the one as the representative of his class, in order to place before his readers very concretely & clearly, thus individualized presentation the earnest warning with which it deals. And at the same time the "du", "thou", is a powerful appeal to the conscience of every individual Gentile Christian. Cp. the 5th 1st Cor. in 2, 14. "Du aber, der du now wilden Celbaum bist, bist unter solchen eingepfropft worden" ("and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them"), 5th 5th 1st Cor. 15, 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

11/15-24.

ibidem", "zwischen ihnen", namely between the original branches who have remained branches the believing Israelites who have now become believing Christians. "Und bist mit ihnen gleichartig geworden," (супроводя, "aus Wurzeln und der Festigkeit der Olivenbaums". That means without image: "thru faith in the Gospel, as, for example, Peter expresses himself, you have become partakers of the beneficia Christi, namely of the reconciliatio cum Deo patre, of the remissio peccatorum, justitiae, victoriae mortis et aeternae felicitatis. But there are even the blessings which were already promised to the fathers, & of which also already the believers of the Old Covenant were partakers thru faith in the promise. In v. 13 Paul had the olive tree before his eyes first of all in its original form, as it were, in the first stage of its growth: the roots are the patriarchs, the branches the believing children of the Old Covenant. Now, in the New Covenant the tree had changed its appearance, had entered upon a new stage of development. The believing Israelites now called upon the name of Jesus Christ. They nourished & fed themselves from the Gospel of Christ. And in the communion of the believers from Israel there are found believers out of all the nations of the earth. Still it is not another tree, but still the same olive tree. There is one Church of God in the Old & in the N. T., whose roots reach back to Abraham, yea, to Adam. The Christ who appeared in the flesh, the Lord of the Gentiles, is the Messiah of Israel. The promise, which had been imparted to the fathers of Israel & their children, stands forth as designated as fulfilled in the Gospel of Christ, who was crucified & has risen again from the dead. And to the believing Jews have come the believing Gentiles. Yet, that fact the Apostle here gives the Gentile Christians to consider, that the Gentiles have come to the Jews & not the reverse, that the Kingdom of God was originally entrusted to the Jews, that the Jews have a great right, the first claim on the blessings of the Kingdom of God. Christ had already given expression to this truth when he said: "Many shall come from the east & west, and shall sit down with Abraham, & Isaac, & Jacob, in the Kingdom of heaven." Matt. 23. To the patriarchs of Israel & to their children were the first places granted at the tables in the Kingdom of heaven. And John 19:10 "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold. them also must I bring into the fold of the Shepherd to the lost & saved sheep from the house of Israel. In his letter to the Ephesians, e.g., Paul reminds the Christians, from among the Gentiles of the fact that they were formerly without Christ, alienated from & outside of the commonwealth of Israel & alienated from the Testaments of promise & therefore without hope & without God, but that thru the preaching of the Gospel they had been brought near to Christ, to God, to the household of God in Israel, from 1:13-15 ἵνα ἡμεῖς ὡς ἔξω πολῖται, ἀλλὰ ὡς πολῖται μετὰ τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

But if that is the case on this side, then on the other side we must not, but you turning from the wild olive tree, have been grafted into the good olive tree, "welche nicht wider die Zweige, sondern gegen die Aeste", v. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100. That is the warning which the Apostle had given: "warnen die Heiden Christen gegen alle Feinde & Bosheit, welche in der Welt

"against the branches," that is, not against the Jews in general, but, as most of the expositors take it correctly, against the broken off branches, the Israelites who have fallen away & are excluded from the congregation of salvation. The self-pride can refer only to the fact that they themselves, the Gentiles, are partakers of the salvation, but those have lost the same. "Denn du dich aber wickst du reichmet," thus knows then consider, what supply itself of itself: "nicht du trägst die Wurzel, sondern die Wurzel dich." ("But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee"). Out of the root rises power, & say into the tree & presser thou leaves & branches. The roots are the patriarchs of Israel, who have become what they are simply thru God's Word & promise. The meaning is thus this: What gives power & maintenance to your Christianity, you Gentile Christians is your connection with the root, with the promise which, looked to the Father of Israel, & which now has taken the form of the Gospel. Only so long as a Christian abides, and inhales power & life out of God's Word does he remain a living member of the congregation of God. The living Word of God maintains, faith & holds the believer firmly in his communion & congregation of God. Therefore no Christian can account it to himself as merit that he has remained in his place unto this time & has no reason to boast against those who have fallen from their station.

"Du wirst nun sagen: Die Zweige sind ausgebrochen worden, damit ich eingegriffen werde" ("Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in"). V. 2. Paul acknowledges with the Kallō, "ὡς", "ὡς", v. 2, the fact, to which the Gentile Christian points, namely that the fall of the Jews has led to the conversion & acceptance of the Gentiles. But he disproves the tendency of that contradiction, namely, as if the Jews had to make place, for the Gentiles, because now, since the entrance of the Gentiles into the Kingdom of God, God had a special pleasure in the Gentiles & a special displeasure in the Jews. No, "sie sind ausgebrochen worden um der Unglauben willen!" ("because of unbelief they were broken off"). Not because they were Jews, but because they had denied their faith, these Israelites had lost salvation & had been cut off & shut out, from the congregation of salvation. "Du aber stehst durch den Glauben" ("and thou standest by faith"), οὕτως ὡς ἵστης ἐν τῇ χάριτι. Thus, faith you stand in the place, from which those have fallen. You still stand firmly in faith in God's Word & promise, & therefore you still stand in grace. With Philippi we take the "standing" as a real expression, concerning the condition of grace, the condition of salvation, & not as figurative; for we do not otherwise say that the branches stand in the tree. Yet because that is so, therefore "sein nicht hochartig" ("be not highminded"), μὴ ὑψίζετε, do not raise yourselves above the broken off branches, but "fürchte dich nicht" ("but fear"), so that you do not also lose the faith. "Denn wenn Gott der natürlichen Zweige," the fallen Israelites, "nicht verschont hat, so ist gar kein Grund, dass er auch dich nicht verschonen wird" ("For if God spared not the natural branches, he will not spare thee"). μὴ γὰρ οὐδὲ σὺ ἐλπίσθης, namely, if you abandon the faith. Hoffmann: Unbelief has made it that the branches have been broken off, & it is, faith by means of which the Gentile stands there where those have fallen away. If he (the Gentile Christian) considers this, then fear will be nearer him than pride, in that he

we repeat what we have said on 11, 11-15, that among the Jews who have left off from unbelief & still find grace, resp. have turned again after the fall from faith & are accepted by God, unbelief has still not ended to the word, even to hardening. Their, "all was no definite fall & their desiring of salvation was no continuing, final desiring. The expression ἔγκεν τρις τήσονται "sie werden eingegröpft werden" ("they shall be grafted in"), is confirmed in v. 23b with the pointing to the power of God: Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς πάλιν ἔγκεν τρις αὐτοὺς, "denn Gott ist wohl im Stande sie wieder einzugröpfen" ("for God is able to graft them in again"). It would be peculiar, if the Apostle hereby only wanted to say that God has the power to forgive the penitent, also those who repent again after the fall, & to reinstate them. Then far rather an appeal to the great grace of God would be in place. The mention of the power, of the omnipotence of God points above all, as also Philippi emphasizes, to the influence of God on the heart & conscience of the apostates. The omnipotent God has the power also to fulfill the condition of reacceptance, the return to faith. The omnipotent God has the power to convert sinners, & also to convert the fallen again & thus to fit them into the congregation of saints again. Also the engrafting of the Gentiles into the good olive tree, mentioned in v. 17, includes in itself the conversion of the Gentiles. The principle statement ἔγκεν τρις τήσονται is still confirmed by another argument: Εἰ γὰρ οὗ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκτότης ἀγριελίου καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἔνεκεν τρις ὄν, εἰς καλλιέλαιον πόσῳ μᾶλλον οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἔγκεν τρις τήσονται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλπίδι; We translate & paraphrase: "Denn wenn du aus deinem natürlichen Baum, nämlich dem wilden Ölbaum ausgehauen und deiner Natur quider in den guten Ölbaum eingegröpft worden bist, wie viel mehr wirst du, die von Natur Feinde sind, in ihren eigenen Ölbaum eingegröpft werden?" 11. v.: "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, & wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?" Πόσῳ μᾶλλον here also means quanto potius, "wie viel eher", and not "wie viel leichter." The natural happens much rather & more probable, than the unnatural. Without figure, the Christians from among the Gentiles have been taken out of the degenerate generation of mankind, to which they belonged by birth, custom, & habit & contrary to their, form & nature have been engrafted into the Church of God. Much rather shall Israelites, who originally, that means, by virtue of the divine call & promise, which had been given to Israel, were members of the congregation of God, after they had denied their nature, been replaced into their original place, into their old habitation.

We can add some remarks to the explanation of the text. The foregoing section, which, first of all, discusses the relationship of the Gentile Christians to the believers out of Israel, also contains important general truths. First of all, still a remark concerning the image of the olive tree. It hardly needs mentioning that in the comparison of this comparison the image towards the matter is telling. For in reality the interchange of the engrafting is complicated only in this manner, that branches of a good tree are grafted into a wild tree, in order to improve the same. The good olive tree is, as we have seen, a picture

as beloved children of God & as elect of God. Nevertheless he warns them against apostasy, & certainly definite apostasy. Those whom God has already chosen for Himself from eternity, & has ordained to glory, He has also called & justified, & by nothing, by no power of earth or hell can they be separated from the love of God in Christ, be separated permanently. Altho they also deviate for a time, still they come aright again & certainly reach the goal of their redestination. That Paul had taught in Rom. 8:29 ff. But also the elect, to whom salvation is guaranteed by their eternal election, still need the warning against pride, self-exaltation, & apostasy & the admonition to fear, that they will see to it that they are not cut off. For they still have the flesh in themselves, which strives against the grace & goodness of God & in general is inclined to alienate. With regard to God, to the divine election & calling, to God's promise, we Christians are certain, completely certain of our salvation. But while we still have flesh & blood, we at the same time work out our salvation with fear & trembling, & watch & pray without ceasing, so that our flesh does not seduce us & bring us to a fall. And such admonitions & warnings, as we find them in our text, are means in God's hands to preserve His own, from apostasy. A Christian who earnestly asks about the salvation of his soul, finds no dissonance between the comfort of the election & the warning against apostasy. Only he who considers these earnest things in another interest, as interest in salvation, only he who here speculates & would satisfy the desires of his foolish reason, runs here into the contradictions. To such that also happens very correctly, when he is entangled in his own thoughts & continues to hang in the trap which he himself has laid.

Summary of the section: The Apostle warns the Christians from among the Gentiles against pride & self-exaltation over the Gentiles who have fallen away & have been put out of the Church of God, in that he gives them to consider, that out of pure goodness & of grace they have been implanted into the communion of God, from whom they were once far & exchanged, & certainly also on their part shall be cut off, if they do not continue in unity, if they do not remain in the goodness of God.

11, 25-32. The Full Number of the Gentiles and all Israel.

Vv. 25-27.

To the twofold ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν in v. 23 and v. 24, which refers to the cut-off branches of the olive tree, there adds the Apostle further instructions, which is introduction v. 25 with the words: Ὁς γὰρ

($\text{ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀποκρύπτει τὰς ἀποδείξεις, τοῦ ὁποῦτος τοῦτο, ὅτι, ὅτι ἐν ἐαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν}$). The Apostle would now share a mystery with his brethren, the Christian readers, & not conceal the same, from them, so that they would not be wise in themselves in their own thoughts, which would say, that they might not give room to their own thoughts in the matter about which it treats. According to 17 B we read with Bachmann, Theodorof, Meyer, Weiss, but not others, ἐν ἐαυτοῖς . The another reading, τῶν

the Gentiles in great numbers are converted to Christ, until the end of the world, always some Jews shall be converted. Orlander remarks on that point: Nos vero Judaeos ea de causa non ex terminamus a mundo, quia adhuc in eo populo sunt quidam electi, ad fidem christianam antea obitum suum reducendi. And this remained the reigning interpretation in the old Lutheran Church. Thus writes, for example, D. Kramer: sicut conversio gentium non facta est simpliciter, catholice et simul, sed successiva, sparsim et gradualiter; ita concedimus, Judaeos sparsim et successiva convertendos, si jam modo aliquamultos conversos esse, et subinde converti haud paucos, qui in oculis Dei collecti et notissime conscripti haud parvam constituent multitudinem. Some of these expositors, as, for example, Bugenhagen, Brenz, Orlander, the "Weimarer Paraphrasten", & Pappus, thereby point τὰς ἑσχατὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴל spiritualis, Gal. 6:16, tam ex gentibus, quam ex Israelis carnalis collectus. Most of them, however, note the contrast between Israel and the Gentiles, & take the "gauge Israel" as the coetus electorum ex Israelitis (Gal. 6:16) or the totus electorum Judaeorum numerus, i. e. non peculiaris temporis momenti, sed toto decursu Novi Testamenti vocandus (Huelshemmen) or tam ille, qui fuit in antiquis Veteris Testamenti temporibus, quam ille, qui in primitiva ecclesia vixit, imo et iste, qui nostris saeculis supervicturus est, atque ita omnes omnium temporum Israel continuo ecclesiae incremento calvandus et ad cognitionem Jesu Christi perducendus (Kramer). Calvin & the most renowned teachers of his school are of the same opinion.

Certainly now also that other interpretation de insigni et notabili conversione Judaeorum sub finem mundi, only with deduction of the commentum Judaicum de reditu Eliae, had its advocates & adherents in the old Protestant Church, among the Lutherans, for example, Mylius, Lipius, Hunnius, B. Baldwin, B. Meiser, & Neyerasser, among the Reformed, for example, Martyr, Beza, Grotius, Voetius, Bisigatmann, and Piscator. The last two named bring the general conversion of the Jews into connection with the "resurrection of the martyrs" as a "thousand-year reign of converted Israel." Calvin understands Rom. 11:25, 26 of his act that all still remaining heathen nations, as also the Turkes & Mohammedans, & finally also those, who still be Christians, nations before the end of the world, in the sense as, for example, Germany is called Christian, since Apoc. 7:9, & Crusius the acceptance of a general conversion of the Jews, which should follow after the entrance of the millions of the Gentiles into the Christian Church, in part with chiliaris aera, has found general propagation & is advocated by the majority of modern expositors. According to Ritzsch, Kuiper & Holuck τὰς ἑσχατὰς designates the majority of the Israelites, according to Reiche & Meyer the sum-total, the totality of the nations, "there shall be no unbelieving Jews," according to Weiss, Kodel, Hofmann & Othardt the people of

(Israel as such, as a nation, as a congregation of people, Israel as a unity of people, "which always does not exclude the remaining of the individual in unbelief." Still in more modern times, E. S. Luthardt correctly remarks, a change has begun, a return to the exegesis of the ancient church, rather of the majority of the old Lutheran theologians. Already Olshausen defines τὰς ἑσχατὰς in the following manner: "all those members of the Israelite nation, who always belonged to the true Noëvux," then Philippi, in his appendix to his third edition of

his commentary: "the chosen part of the Jews," similarly Kischoltz in his "Christlichen Eschatologie," 1856, p. 126f.; Otto: "all Israel will be saved"; Muehlmeier's "Zeitschrift für Kirche-liche Wissenschaft," new, 1886, p. 531-532: "the part of Israel gradually converting itself." Only Marc Brownell ("Der Israel Gottes" 1881) permits all Israel, from among believing Gentiles & Jews to continue. The advocates of the general conversion of the Jews at the end of days emphasize as strongly as possible that this thought of theirs alone does justice to the reading of the scriptures, while the old church interpretation owes its origin to dogmatic interests. In an exact examination of the text the reverse might present itself at the end, namely, that the old church interpretation, if we would take it so *a priori*, is taken from the biblical text & context, while the hope of a glorious future of Israel is closely interwoven with the chilianistic interest. Therefore we would more exactly inspect the words of Paul in Rom. 11, 25, 26 and thereby not leave from our sight their connection with the entire apostolic amplification in Rom. 9-11.

It is a tri-member sentence, in which the Apostle brings to expression the content of the mystery. The first thing which he would not conceal from his brethren is that Israel in part has experienced hardening. It is not in that as Hofmann supposes, that this statement gains a suitable content through connection with the following designation of the goal upon the modifier of the hardening, on the *αὐτὸς, ὁ ἰσχυρὸς* his stress. That certainly does not mean, as Hofmann supposes, "einstweilig," temporarily but only "theilweise" (partially), & one also connects it not with *τὸ ἰσχυρὸν*, but with *τὸ ἰσχυρὸν γέγραπται*, then the meaning is still no other than that not all Israelites, but only a part of Israel has experienced obduracy, even if it is also the greater part. Herein almost all expositors agree. The *αὐτὸς, ὁ ἰσχυρὸς* finds its modifier in the context. The Apostle had said of that in v. 5-7, that also in the present time there had remained a remnant in Israel according to the election of grace & that the remnant had received that which Israel had not received, the salvation in Christ. Then he had added: "And the rest were blinded." From that one could somewhat conclude that all Israelites who at the time of the Apostle had not become partakers of the salvation & found themselves outside of the Christian Church, had been hardened. But that is not the case. The Apostle calls special attention to the fact, that not all the unbelieving Israelites at that time lay under the judgment of obduracy. That the Christ-believing Israel is exempted from obduracy is all too self-evident; that he does not need to say that. The remark, that Israel only in part has experienced obduracy, only then has sense & understanding when he has in view especially the unbelieving Israel & would only make this perceptible to his readers, that the unbelieving Israel at that time has not altogether fallen to obduracy. He had just previously, v. 23, 24, established the possibility, & expressed the expectation, that some of the cut-off branches of the olive tree would leave their unbelief & again be grafted in. Even these Israelites according to his meaning do not belong to the hardened, as we have already remarked above. And what he presupposes there, when he speaks of the reconversion of the apostates, that he now expressly specifies & demonstrates this fact, that Israel only in part is obdurate. That he also judges in Israel

which now stands hostile over against Christianity, there are found not only obdurate ones, but also unbelieving ones, to whom the possibility is still as it was, to turn away from their $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha$. And this partial obduracy shall also in the future be the characteristic of Israel & shall continue until the time mentioned in the second phrase of the sentence.

Israel has in part experienced hardening, $\alpha\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha$. Most expositors translate: "bis dass die Hülle resp. Völkzahl der Heiden eingegangen sein wird" (Lit. Vi. until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in), *donec plenitudo gentium intraverit*, and refer the $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha$ very correctly not to the entrance of the Gentiles into the regnum gloriae, as, for example, Bth & Klipföth, but to the entrance of the Gentiles into the communion formed with the olive tree, into the Church of Christ. The entire content treats of the development & continuance of the Kingdom of God here on earth. In the modifiers of the concept "Völkzahl der Heiden", however, the opinion separates. Meyer takes the same as the totality of the Gentiles, of all single individuals. The conversion of the Gentiles follows successively, uninterruptedly; but when their totality shall be converted, then the total conversion of the Jews shall also follow. Weiss agrees, except that he exempts "individuals who persist in unbelief" from the totality. But according to the Scriptures the Church of Christ appears throughout as the little flock, which has the unbelieving world against itself, & even toward the end of

(the world unrighteousness shall take the upper hand, so that Christ, when He shall come, shall find as good as no faith on the earth. $\sigma\omicron\delta\epsilon\tau\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ is already latent, understood under the $\alpha\gamma\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha$ "die Gesamtheit der Nationen", "das Völkthum der Völkerthum". "So long as there is still found a part of the nations," that is, any nation on earth, "outside of the Christian Church, so long the end of the blinding of Israel is not present." But, as Otto correctly remarks, the Scriptures know nothing of a dismemberment of the $\epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha$ into the individual nations & knows nothing of the so-called Christian nations as constituent parts of the Christian Church. No, Paul has in mind here those Gentiles, but even also all the Gentiles, who shall go into the Christian Church or, what is the same, shall be converted to Christ. They form a closed number, which is known alone to God the Lord & which God has established from the beginning. As the pleroma of the Jews in 11:12 is the full number of the elect out of Israel, so the pleroma of the Gentiles is the full number of the elect out of the Gentile world, "the full number of the Gentiles destined to salvation" (Theophylact), $\pi\lambda\epsilon\rho\omega\mu\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, *quotquot comprehendant proposita Dei* (v. Nitzsch), "the elect among the Gentiles" (Krummacker). All those whom God has called has converted & still converts in time from among the Jews and Gentiles, are according to 9:23, 24 the vessels of mercy, whom He has predestinated to glory, $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha$.

($\epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha$). And their sum is even the pleroma of the Jews & Gentiles. What Paul teaches in accordance with the final prophetic discourses of the Lord concerning the conversion of the Gentiles is the following. He, Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, had first carried the Gospel of Christ, the Son of God, into the Gentile world & established the obedience of faith among the Gentiles. But this Gospel shall be preached on earth until the end of the world, as a testimony to all nations. Matt. 24:14. And so at all times shall work be wrought to the Lord, first out of this,

404
11, 25-27.

them out of that nation. Through the entire N.H. era, Christendom shall be gathered out of all generations of his earth. And when the last of the Gentiles who are predestinated to glory have been called, have been converted to Christ, then are the times of the Gentiles fulfilled, Luke 21:24, then the pleroma of the Gentiles is at hand, then the full number of the Gentiles shall have entered into the Kingdom of God.

And when it now reads that Israel in part has experienced hardening, until, "bis," 21:25, 23, the full number of the Gentiles shall have entered in, then this connection of thought does not necessarily state that when the here-designated time has been reached, the hardening shall cease & Israel shall be freed from its present severe fate & judgment. Only so much is hereby attested, that the hardening shall endure until that time, that during the entire period of the conversion of the Gentiles, Israel, even the hardened part, remains lying under the curse of obduracy. When the Evangelist Matthew remarks in 1:25, that Joseph had not known his wife, until, E'w, 25, she had borne her first son, thus he would not have that understood thus, as if he had then known her, after she had borne her first son. When the Evangelist John remarks in 9:15 that the Jews did not believe concerning that one born blind, that he had been blind & had been made to see, until, E'w, 8:10, they called his parents, then it is not thereby said that they believed it after they had called & questioned the parents. In many cases the E'w, 25, which is synonymous with 21:25, or E'w, 25, the Hebrew T' or "D-T", points to a turning point, at which the action or event does not cease, but really enters into a new condition. We read in Gen. 49:10, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver, from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." That is not meant so, that Judah would lose the sceptre, the reign, when Shiloh comes. "T" is in this blessing not possibly such an exclusive "bis." Delitzsch. The meaning is much rather this, that when Shiloh has come, the reign of Judah will take on a new relation, thus the Shiloh will stretch itself over all nations of the earth. God had said to the Messiah, the Son and Lord of David: "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Ps. 110:1). On this Delitzsch remarks: "T" does not exclude the time beyond, but, as in Gen. 49:10, so certainly that it designates above all the final subjection of the enemy as a turning point with which something else ensues, in that then the regnum crucis changes into the regnum gloriae. And so in our passage with the 21:25, 23 at the same time it is shown that at the entrance of the pleroma of the Gentiles a change of things is to be expected wherein this change consists will present itself of itself, after we have taken more closely considered the third member of the sentence. It is now only once again to be noted that the assumption that Israel would still exist as a nation or as a people at the end of the world, when it would be withdrawn from the judgment of obduracy, directly contradicts what Paul had already said concerning obduracy. And the scriptures in general teach concerning obduracy. The following remarks: "I see a curse in the 21:25, 23 - a punishment, even such as will begeth for the origin of the punishment itself, in general it is in a general sense a punishment, but then the punishment is proclaimed by God is therefore always."

to be looked upon as a definite act of judgment, not as a temporary corrective. A suspension of this nature,

(would be conceivable only thru a contradiction of God with Himself."

The description of the mystery comes to an end in the statement: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$ with the $\epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$ is meant not the future, perfected salvation, but, as is almost generally acknowledged, the $\epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$, which falls in time, concerning which the Apostle had spoken in $\text{I. II. } \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$, $\text{I. IV. } \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$, the deliverance which consists in this, that Israel would be partakers of the salvation in Christ, which falls together with the conversion to Christ. Thus on the basis of this passage we speak of the conversion of Israel. Even so in $\text{Eph. } 2, 11$, Paul designates the conversion of the Gentiles, the awakening from spiritual death to a new spiritual life as deliverance, $\chi\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$. This deliverance certainly has the future $\epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$ as a result. And what now concerns the subject concept $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$, so the eschatology of the hope of a general conversion of the Jews before the end of the world have no right in reality to claim this word order for themselves. It is very solemnly announced here by the Apostle, that all Israel shall be converted, saved. Therefore in this context we must take $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$ in its full worth, as the whole which includes all individual parts in itself, not in the vague, popular sense, as, for example, in $\text{Rom. } 11, 1$, where it is said concerning all Israel, that they read the law of the

(Continued with Nehabram, or in Luke 2:1, where it reads of all the people, that they were baptized of John.)
A mass conversion of the Jews, which in general would be something singular, resp. a conversion of a nation,
which did not include in itself all those belonging to the nation, is no conversion of all Israel. Also the interpretation
of Meyer, which expects the conversion of all Israelites without exception, but restricts the same also
to the Israel of the last time, does not satisfy the expression, אֵל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל. One understands under אֵל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל
the entire physical Israel, then nothing else remains than that one accepts with the dreamer Peter von
that all the Israelites who have died in unbelief shall rise from the dead before the end of the world's with the still
living be converted to the Lord. The conversion of all Israel according to the latter interpretation is essentially
identical with the conversion of the obdurate Israel. Conversion of the obdurate, however, as already remarked,
is a contradiction in itself. Certainly now also the reference of the אֵל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל to the entire people of God gather-
ed from among the Jews & Gentiles, offends against the context. In the entire historical amplification from
2:1 on, Israel & the Gentiles are contrasted to one another, & also in our passage, 11:25-26a, differentiated
from one another. When one takes into consideration all that which the Apollon had said in the three chap-
ters, 9-11, concerning the deliverance of Israel, then one can confidently maintain that the context not only

It is near but actually enforces the ancient church interpretation, according to which totius coetus
electorum of Israel is meant with 10px 1. In 7, 6, 9 he had amplified that not all the physical
descendants of Abraham, but only the children of the promise who are called according to design in con-
formity to the election, are Israel, the real Israel. In 7, 22, 28 he had pointed to the prophecy, according to which
the great multitude of Israel would fall to the judgment only a remnant would be converted and saved. In

11, 14. he had spoken of the people of God, whom God had chosen for Himself beforehand. In 11, 14 he had testified that, as in the days of Elijah, so also in the present time there had been a remnant which (present) as a result of the election of grace, stood the election had attained that which Israel had not attained, the salvation in Christ. That is the Israel which believes in Christ. In 11, 11-15 he had declared that he had claimed at that with the conversion of the Gentiles, at the same time, to entire his brethren according to the flesh & to save some of them, τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν. Here he had mentioned the ἀλλήλων of the Jews, that is, as we have proven above, the full number of the elect out of Israel. The progress of the deliverance of Israel is thus, according to the presentation of the Apostle, the following. Already from eternity God had chosen a people for Himself out of Israel, a pleroma. And those whom He had already chosen for Himself from eternity He has then called, converted in time. There at all times in Israel there has been a remnant, a small group of true children of Abraham & children of God, also at the worst time of apostasy. At the time of Christ & of the Apostle this remnant stood firm, the ἐκλεκτοί, from among those Israelites who had joined themselves to Christ & who had then entered into the Christian Church. But also later there were many Jews, who did not believe at first who were drawn to the following of Christ from the converted Gentiles. And so also in the future there shall always be still some, τινες, won out of Israel, until the pleroma of Israel is at hand, until the full number (of Israel) has been fulfilled, has become the possession of Christ. And how can τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν in this connection in our passage now mean anything else than an identical with the pleroma of Israel, with the people whom God had already beforehand chosen for Himself? And how can τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν not be understood otherwise than that the conversion & deliverance of even this pleroma shall finally stand as a completed, act! (Philippii). When the last elect out of Israel shall have been converted to Christ then the remnants of all times are brought together, & these remnants of all times form even the whole Israel. This whole actually concludes all the individual parts in itself without exception.

Only with this interpretation of the words τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν does the καὶ οὕτως, which is placed at the head, explain itself. This is mostly taken by the defenders of the opposite opinions as a designation of time, in the sense of καὶ τότε. When Meyer, Wiesner & others translate & explain: "und so, nämlich ~~den~~ nachdem das πᾶν ἔθνος εἰσέγγαγεν ἔσται", and take the condition as a chronological order, then this explanation also runs into an "und so dann", "and in that case". Against this Otto correctly remarks: "Schweigkühner sagt in l.c., οὕτως is ἐπὶ ἐξ ἑστῆς, and he has done well to explain himself cautiously, for the appearance, as if οὕτως would express a chronological order, and in that case, comes out only by the fact that something must be constituted so or so, that it must have been present previously in some sort of condition, before it can work into the following matter. The condition is never contained in the chronological order as such, like I say: ἔτι ζῶν αὐτόν. καὶ οὕτως ἀπέκτενον, then it means this: They took him dead. In the other

hand, $\epsilon\upsilon\psi\chi\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\iota\upsilon\chi\upsilon$ means: but they struck him & then they killed him.

($\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ does not absolutely take that which was said previously together as an event that has gone before, but it takes that which has gone before into the following statement as a co-operating phase, as a co-efficient. And so in all the passages cited by M., when they are correctly explained. Thus in the N. T. Acts 7, 3: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\ \rho\eta\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \lambda\omicron\alpha\kappa\kappa$, not only: then (Nothmann), but so, which means: by virtue of the covenant & the promise of the covenant. Acts 27, 44: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$, and on that, in the previously given manner. Acts 27, 44, not then (Nothmann), but so, which is cheered by the brotherly participation. 1 Cor. 11, 28: not $\iota\omicron\delta\alpha\mu\mu\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\gamma\omega$, but, inwardly prepared by self-examination, let him eat, etc. "Even so it is with the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ in 5, 14; Acts 20, 11; 1 Cor. 14, 25; 1 Thes. 4, 17; 2 Thes. 2, 15. Now if one takes the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ also in our passage which is alone permissible, as a designation of the $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\ \&\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha$, then one can draw it over to the second member of the sentence. Then the meaning would be: And so, in the manner described above, thus the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ. Through the converted Gentiles the Jews shall also be enticed into the following & so in the course of time always more Israelites shall be converted saved until at last $\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \rho\eta\mu\alpha$ is saved. That would be essentially the same thought that already came into expression in 4, 11 and 4, 14 and is re-

peated in v. 21. But it lies closer, that with Philippi, C. H. Hofmann & Scharff we refer the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$, "and so" ("and so") back to the first part of the sentence, certainly in its connection with the designation of the goal, $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\ \&\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha$. For in the foregoing that which was remarked concerning the obduracy of Israel & the real statement, & the emphasized $\alpha\iota\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ in this reference comes to its full right. The opinion of Hofmann, that $\alpha\iota\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\rker\varsigma$ signifies "temporarily, & out of the circumstance that Israel is hardened only temporarily, for a time, the later suspension of the obduracy explains itself, is absolutely excluded, for as the content of v. 25 b, as shown above, is the following: Israel is partially hardened; there are unbelieving Jews who are thus not obdurate, & this partial hardening of Israel shall continue until the fulness of the Gentiles shall have entered in, or, what is the same thing, until the end of the world, for according to Matt. 24, 14 the Gospel shall be preached to the Gentiles until the end. "And so", that is accordingly the meaning of $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ etc., in that the partial hardening of Israel, which shall continue to the end, gives the possibility & opening for a continual partial conversion of the Jews; at all times there shall be some wrought out of Israel, until then at the end of the time the $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$ of Israel is at hand. At all events $\alpha\iota\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\rker\varsigma$ is a correlate to $\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\alpha\iota\alpha$. That is only a part, but certainly the large-

est part of Israel is hardened, makes possible the deliverance of the minority part. For so long a time God leaves Israel under the curse of obduracy, because according to His eternal decree He will always bring the fulness of the Gentiles into His Kingdom before the conclusion of the time of the world. Obduracy, however, concerns only a part of the people of Israel, & not out of the unbelieving nation of Jews always more souls shall be converted to Christ in the course of time, & so the eternal counsel of God

for the deliverance of all Israel that he now says first at the conclusion of this historical presentation of this statement in vv. 25.26a is the solemn manifestation of the mystery, to which the expressions τὸ ἔκρυπτον καὶ ἄκρυτον in v.12 and ἡ πρὸς ἡμᾶς in v.15 had pointed out, which they had already prepared for as it is now also clear, what false thoughts Paul would present with the remark. Ἰδὲ νῦν φητέ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὁρῶντες in v.25a. We have already remarked on 25a above, that someone could suppose that the entire unbelieving nation of the Jews, which at the time of the Epistle stood hostile over against the Christian Church, had fallen under the judgment of obduracy & was thus hopelessly lost. And especially among Gentile Christians such thoughts arose. Therefore the Apostle testifies to his readers that these are erroneous thoughts & assures them that not all the Israelites who did not believe at that time were hardened, that there was still hope for Israel, that a ἑσπέρων still existed in Israel, which in its time would be converted to Christ & thus be saved. And with this assurance he confirms the expectations expressed in vv. 23.24, that the cut-off olive branches would again be engrafted into their own olive tree.

To the last statement in v.25a there is added in vv. 25b.27a quotation from the 3. Th. καὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται ὁ ἑσπέρων ἐκ Σιών ὁ σωτὴς καὶ ἀποστρέψει τὴν ἀνομίαν ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀσπύσει αὐτοῖς.

(ἡ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐκ Σιών ὁ σωτὴς ἀπέλθων, τὸν ἀσπύσει αὐτοῖς. "Es wird aus Zion der Erretter kommen und die Gottlosigkeit, die von Jakob abwandern; und dies wird der Bund sein, mit dem ich sie, wenn ich wegnehme ihre Sünden." As it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, & shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins. This quotation is a combination of various prophetic statements. The principal statement concerning the coming of the Deliverer is taken from the prophecy of Isaiah 59.22. The prophetic discourse in Isa. 59 is a discourse of reproof to apostate Israel which ends in the threat of judgment in v.17. At the close in v.20, the threat changes into a promise. It reads in v.20 according to the original text: καὶ ἔρχεται ὁ σωτὴς καὶ ἀποστρέψει τὴν ἀνομίαν ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀσπύσει αὐτοῖς. "And so, wird kommen der Erretter und gewar, die die, welche sich in Jakob von Missethat bekehren." "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, & unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob." As in Isa. 59.12 the maasa peridita, which would inevitably lead to the judgment, the remnant which would turn, which would be converted to the living God, so here, too, the Israel which was hostile to God, which the Lord would repay with revenge, zeal & terror, there is contrasted that part of Jacob, which would be turned from their trans-

gressions. The ἔρχεται ὁ σωτὴς καὶ ἀποστρέψει τὴν ἀνομίαν ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, concerning which the ἔρχεται is expressed. To the remnant of Jacob of promise in Isa. 59, so to them shall the Deliverer, the Messiah, come. And what the Redeemer shall do to them is stated in v.21. That reads in conformity with the original text: "Und ich - das ist mein Bund mit ihnen, spricht der Herr: mein Geist, welcher auf dir, und meine Worte, welche ich in deinen Mund gelegt habe, werden nicht von deinem Munde und

V. 28-32.

(καὶ, μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροὶ δι' ὑμᾶς, καὶ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπτοὶ διὰ τοῦς πατέρας. V. 28. "Nach dem Evangelium sind die Feinde um ewelwillen, nach der Wahl aber Beliebte um des Vaters willen": "As concerning the gospel, they are enemies, for your sakes; but as touching the election, they are beloved, for the father's sake." This statement stands at the side of the previous statement entirely unmediated, without a binding member. That lets it be known already, that it lies on the same line with the same, that it states essentially the same thing. The unnamed subjects, concerning whom the two-fold thing is expressed, that they on the one hand are objects of hatred & on the other hand are objects of the love of God, are no others than those concerning whom the previous discussion was, namely the unbelieving Jews, whose conversion still stands awaited, or, as below remarks, the Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐκλογῆς, whose conversion still stands out. Let there it says a first of all, that they are enemies of God, which means, that they have God as an enemy; what concerns the Gospel would say, because they stand hostilely over against the Gospel. The added δι' ὑμᾶς, for your sakes, for your benefit, shows that in this manner salvation has fallen to the Gentiles. The unbelief of the Jews in general, not only the unbelief which continues on to obduracy, has moved God to turn salvation to the Gentiles. On the other hand, they are beloved of God, which relates to the election. ἐκλογῆς here has the

same sense as it is sharply ^{and distinctly} distinguished in v. 5. 2. God loves them, insofar as because He has chosen them for Himself from the beginning, because they belong to the people of God in Israel, which God had previously chosen for Himself. The second member of ἀγαπτοὶ, διὰ τοῦς πατέρας, is confirmed in the following sentence & at the same time explained further: Ἐπεὶ ἐκδόθη χάρις τὰς χάρις καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ. V. 29. "Unberent" or "unbereubar", that is "unwiderrücklich" (irrevocable), "und die Gnade nur ausgeben, und die Berufung Gottes" ("for the gifts & calling of God are without repentance"). Here in the context it deals with the one gracious proof of God, the call, & certainly with the call which went out to the fathers. This was offered in the promise given to Abraham, Isaac & Jacob, which promised to them & to their seed with them the real seed, the salvation in Christ. This promise cannot fail, it must & shall fulfill itself in the entire seed, even because of the gifts of God, which are unchangeable. The two reasons adduced for the love of God do not lie outside one another, but in one another; they form a unified motive. Election & calling are also here correlata. The first has the latter as a result. Because God has elected them from the beginning & has already called them to salvation in Christ, in & with the promise which had already from the beginning been given to the fathers, & such election & calling, should certainly fulfill

their purpose, therefore the Israelites, whom the Gospel here has in mind, already now, when they still do not believe, are beloved of God, even though they hate their unbelief.

Paul continues & thereby confirms the principal statement in v. 28 b: "Denn wir ihr, ihr Jüdischen Christen, 'einst', in der pre-Christian times, 'Bott ungelichsam gewesen seid, nun aber durch Erbarmen widerkehret durch den Ungelichsam dieser', which turns the salvation to you, so und auch diese jetzt."

412,
1128-32.

ungehorsam geworden, damit durch das Erbarmen, das euch widerfahren ist, auch sie Barmherzigkeit erlangen. ("For as ye in times past have not believed, yet have ye obtained mercy through their unbelief, even so have these also, now not believing, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy").
vv. 30, 31. The εἰς is a wider concept than ἐν. The former disobedience of the Gentile Christians consisted in the fact that they, like all Gentiles, held themselves free from owing service to God. The present disobedience of the Jews consisted in the fact that they did not obey the Gospel in unbelief. With the εἰς of God there is meant here, as in 1:15, 23, the actual mercy of God, which manifested itself in the conversion of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. The dative τῷ ὑμῶν ἐξ ἡμῶν εἰς εἰς, we refer with most expositors to the final clause. The parallelism with τῇ σωτηρίᾳ καὶ εἰς εἰς demands that the mercy which has befallen the Gentiles should move the Jews to emulation. The meaning of the ὅτι is accordingly this: If unbelieving Jews sooner or later are still converted to Christ, then the same mercy only befalls them, which has befallen you Gentile Christians. What God has done to you, that He can very well also do to them, who find themselves in the same situation in which you formerly found yourselves. He can just as well change their disobedience into obedience, even as He has broken your disobedience. The concluding statement: "Denn Gott hat sie alle dem ungehorsam preisgegeben, damit er sie durch alles Erbarmen" ("for God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all"), v. 32, evidently includes the double statement concerning the Gentiles & the Jews in vv. 30, 31, and thus like the latter serves as the confirmation of the principle statement of the foregoing section, v. 23b. Ἐν ἡμῶν εἰς εἰς corresponds to the Hebrew 7 7 7 7 in the meaning "prelating" (abandon), "überlassen" (relinquish). ὅτι τῶντων are not "all men", but those concerning whom the discussion is in the context in their totality. Hofmann finds in our context, according to the foregoing, this is "the totality of the elect from among the Gentiles & Jews." He says: "All these God had for a long time abandoned to their disobedience, with the purpose that He might have mercy on them all, might bring them all to obedience, to faith in their time & might thus make them partakers of the salvation in Christ." The passage, vv. 31-32, contains, moreover, a general admonition, which all Christians should well take to heart. We should not regard all unbelievers, with whom we have to do as hopelessly lost men, even if they at the time strongly speak against the Gospel, but consider well that God's mercy is not outwitted & can still do in others what it has done in us. If we only strongly attest with word and deed the mercy which has befallen us in our neighborhood, then many souls can still be advised and helped.

The entire section, vv. 25-32, leads to the point to impress upon the Gentile Christians the statement in v. 25a, which means not the κρίσις, which is sufficiently motivated in the foregoing, but the τῶντων 7 7 7 7. The Apostle had begun the historical description in chap. 2 with the lament over the rejection of Israel. Israel the people which had such great prerogatives as occurred from Christ.

They still lie under the harsh judgment of obduracy, which they had led upon themselves by their stiff-necked unbelief. And obduracy is the sure step of condemnation. But not all Israelites which has been proven further, are hardened & wot. God has from eternity chosen for Himself a people out of Israel, whom He has not hardened. From of old at all times He had preserved a remnant, for Himself in Israel. Now in the time of the New Covenant, a great number of Israelites has entered into the Christian Church. And out of the unbelieving people of the Jews, which at the time hostily oppose the Church of Christ, but are hardened only temporarily, shall at all times until the end of the world many will be won, for Christ. And thus finally the whole Israel, at which God had aimed, which God had chosen for Himself, shall be saved. *Th. 16, p. 11. 1. 500 p. 571.* that is the triumphant conclusion of the historical consideration, which had begun with the bitter lament over the obduracy of Israel.

Summary of the section. vv. 25-32: Since Israel is only hardened in part, time in the course of time until the end of days shall many unbelieving Jews still be converted to Christ, & when the fullness of the Gentiles has entered into the Kingdom of God, then shall also the entire elect Israel be saved.

11, 33-36. The Incomprehensible Wisdom of God.

The historical description in chaps. 9-11, which dealt with the fate of Israel & in connection with that with the fate of the Gentiles, is brought to its end with the statement in 11, 32. In retrospect on the just-presented divine pedagogy, on the works & ways of God among the Jews & Gentiles, the Epistle bursts forth in an exclamation of amazement. *Th. 16, p. 11. 1. 500 p. 571.* *Th. 16, p. 11. 1. 500 p. 571.* "But when we think of the riches of the wisdom & knowledge of God?" *1. 33 a. 1. 33 a.* If one coordinates the three genitives grammatically, still the two latter are meant as modifiers of the first, which would otherwise be too vague & colorless. Riches in wisdom & knowledge is meant. The source of God is the principle concept. The wisdom of God is the whole goal, mentions the means. And because God has wisdom & knowledge, therefore He knows & is acquainted with the right means. The wisdom & knowledge of God is so rich, that no man can grasp & comprehend it, & the riches of the divine wisdom is so deep, that no human understanding canathom them. The immeasurable & unfathomable wisdom of God manifests itself in His unsearchable judgments & His untraceable ways. *Th. 16, p. 11. 1. 500 p. 571.* *Th. 16, p. 11. 1. 500 p. 571.* The Epistle had presented both in the foregoing. The judgments of God are particularly His judgments of obduracy, which end in eternal wrath. These last by both concerning the righteousness & concerning the wisdom of God. God knows how to punish the resistors, as it were, in their own iniquity, in that He gives them over to their perverted mind and abandons them to their self-chosen condemnation. And God knows how to make the judgments of punishment on the godless, the unbelievers, serviceable to His entire plan of the world. In distinction from 11,

Rom. 9: 30: 23 to 5 are to be taken as the gracious ways of God, which lead over into eternal
 life, into an life promised ad. How wonderful & wise are these ways of His! I must truly admire (—
 His divine wisdom, when one considers how God has mercy on the disobedient, how He gathers, for Himself,
 a people of possession out of the apostate Jew's benighted, how He converts the one from the other, that He
 uses the faith as well as the unbelief of the one to turn the other one to salvation, that He preserves the
 world so long in spite of the wickedness of men, until He has carried out His gracious counsel on all
 the elect. And it is an immeasurable, unfathomable wisdom, they are unsearchable, inconceivable judg-
 ments & ways. In that lies the emphasis. True, the ways & judgments of God lie before our eyes in history,
 as the Scriptures also expressly point to them. It is also revealed to us in the Scriptures, for example, in
 Rom. 9: 1, that the judgments of God are caused by man, & that the gracious ways of God have their found-
 ations in God Himself, in God alone. But every thing is not explained by that. The final grounds & motives of
 the divine ways, works & deeds are & remain covered & hidden to us. Bengel's *Scriptura ubique subin-
 tit in eo, quod non minus voluit et dixit et fecit; rationes rerum universalium singulariumque non
 parat; deus, quia non tam superant infantiam, ad aeternitatem remittit* *1 Cor. 13: 8* etc.
 When we consider & compare with one another the history of nations & of individuals, then questions
 & puzzles arise, which we cannot solve, which also the Scriptures do not solve. Why, for example, (—
 does God, who wills the salvation of all, wills the equal guilt, the equal corruption of men convert the
 one, but gives the others over to their reverted, hardened mind, — that we cannot grasp. We here point
 back to that which we have remarked in 7. 5 concerning the mystery of the *discretio peccatorum*. The old
 Fathers & theologians, as it has been shown there, when they deal with this mystery, have combined the two
 statements in Rom. 9: 15 and in Rom. 11: 33, 34 with one another & out of both have proved that we should not
 search into the *causa discretionis*, because God has not revealed them to us. Keener's remarks on this
 passage, similarly as on 7: 15: *Concilium ejus, quibus, reprobatis, damnat aliquos, quibus duntaxat
 eligi et salvari, illum vero non eligi et salvari, nemo potest vel cogitare vel habere ratione perscrutari
 aut et asequi.... Et cum inquirere ejus arcana non possumus, sinus contentis patet actione rerum
 nobis et aditas aliquas, commutationis et ad salutem necessariarum, reliqua conscientiae et
 iudicii deo committamus.*

That his judgments & ways of God are unsearchable & untraceable, for as the Apostle strengthens with these questions, which he takes from the Scriptures, Rom. 11: 33. "Denn wer hat das Verborgene erkannt? Oder wer hat sein Rathschloß gesehen? Oder wer hat ihm etwas zuversagt gegeben", (Gal. 3: 1) "Oder wer hat ihn vorhergesehen, oder ihm etwas vergelten was er? 1" "For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath seen his counsel? or who hath first given to him, & it shall be recompensed unto him again? 2. v. 14, 35. "There are only three situations in which man can know what God has decided or how he shall carry it out, when he looks into the heart of God, when he would thereby

have a share in it, & when according to that which he has paid God he can investigate the repayment, to which he can account. "Hofmann. This threefold thing, however, is not the case. The facts expressed in the three questions together, according to v. 33, have their foundation in the fact that all things are out of God, thru God, & for God, or, $\text{עַל אֲדָרָתוֹ יֵשׁ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲדָרָתוֹ יֵשׁ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲדָרָתוֹ יֵשׁ אֵלֶּיךָ}$. Everything that is & happens has its origin in God, is set in motion by God, & serves God's purpose, also to the finis ultimus, to the glory of God. God is the originally independent One & the absolutely independent One. He is the beginning, middle & end of all things. Even the evil, which is not from God & is contrary to God, insofar as it is comprehended in the רָצוֹן אֱלֹהִים , when God according to His wise counsel permits the same, limits, orders, & directs & makes it serviceable to His purpose. And therefore, because all things are out of God, & for God, all cogitation, & every counselling & cognizance of God is excluded.

It still gives some of that which Bengel has remarked on the preceding passage. Quia haec exclamatio est generalis doctrina adversus omnes curiosas quaestiones de arcanis secretis Dei, deinceps diligenter est observanda. ... Tunc oritur praecipua quaestio: Num quod ad homines attinet, una sit omnium massa, peccato corrupta, quod autem Deum attinet, tam sit clemens et misericors, ut totius sit clementia et misericordia ipsa, cumque hideri non sit quae carnis, sed donum Dei, quid sit, quod

Deus est clemens Jacobo et donat eum, id est, non est autem clemens Esau, sed relinquit eum in incredulitate? quid sit, quod Deus convertit Paulum, mobiliter per fidem, non autem Laipham? Cur donat gentibus fidem et non conservat Iudaeos in fide? Hic, quidem potest, quia hi fuerunt ingrati et Christiani rejecerunt ac evangelium ipsi, illi autem agnoverunt Christum & edixerunt sed quaestio reddit in circulum. Quid enim sit, quod Deus non relinquerit Iudaeos in vera gratitudine et fide, cum tanto facile fuisset ei, fidem in Iudaeis conservare, quam facile fuit gentibus fidem donare. ... Ad haec omnia quaestionum genera respondet Paulus hac exclamatione: O profunditatem divinarum etc. et conjuncta apostolica auctoritate quaestiones curiosas. ... Distinguendum est inter secula et inter res ipsas, quae nostrae cognitioni obiciuntur. Nam, ut sunt duo secula, praesens et futurum, seu mundanum et coeleste, ita et res cognoscendae duplices sunt. Aliae sunt relictas, ut in hoc seculo cognoscantur. Aliae sunt absconditas, ut cognoscantur tantum in futuro seculo. Quae igitur in hoc seculo cognoscendae sunt, eas sunt patefactas per decalogum et evangelium Christi. ... Aliae autem quaestiones, quarum aliquot paulo ante commemoravimus, repositae sunt in futurum seculum, in quo (si modo in hoc seculo rectam fidem habuerimus et obedientiam praestiterimus) omnia Dei arcana cognoscemus.

In a *Gloria Deo Gloria!* "Dm sei Ehr in Ewigkeit Amen" ("to whom be glory forever. Amen"). Paul permits this exclamatio to ring out & at the same time therewith the entire discussion in chap. 8-11, which basically contains a "Theodicea." He hereby summons all Christians not to search into the arcana Dei, much less to find fault with them, but rather to worship. For both reasons we should give the

12, 12:

Thus in the closing portion, vs. 33-35, the Gentile summons the Christians to worship the unfathomable wisdom, the unsearchable, inconceivable judgments & ways of God.

The Christian Life A Reasonable Service.

With the 12. chapter follows, as we have remarked in the Introduction, hermits his second letter to the Romans to begin. In this second letter of his to the Romans, as critics suppose, Paul points to new Pythagorean axioms: "unbloody sacrifice," "spiritual service," and demands of his readers, who through their freedom in physical pleasures had become an offence to the weak brethren, a restriction of this freedom. This hypothesis has no support in the text & is a pure product of dogmatism & charity! His remarks here among other things: "Further against Schütz's hypothesis it is to be objected, that I. Romans, as Spitta conceives it, fall out of the frame of the other letters of the type. Denn das Schriftstück soll ja abgesehen von dem weggelassenen Eingang für den Schluss sein. This letter would then have to contain nothing but admonitions & personal communications, & there is such a Pauline letter just as little as one which, like Rom. 1-11, contains only dogmatic & religious-historical presentations. Only 1-11 and 12-15 combined give a document corresponding to the Pauline type." Just as untenable & arbitrary is the assumption of Schütz, "Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie," 1829, which discovers in chap. 12-14: 15, 1-5; 16, 3-23, a letter of Paul to the Ephesians, which dates from his Roman imprisonment. We take what follows from chap. 12, 1-10 with the larger group of ancient & modern expositors as a continuation of the one & uniform letter to the Romans, which began in 1-7.

VV. 1.2.

With the words $\Pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\iota\omega\ \nu\acute{\upsilon}\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\ \delta\iota\kappa\tau\omega\ \sigma\iota\gamma\eta\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omega\ \lambda\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ the Epistle begins a new part, the closing part of this section which contains admonitions. The $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\ \sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\iota$ is generally taken, & very correctly, as a conclusion out of the entire dogmatical part which started with $\mu\epsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$. "As one thought there lies before the Epistle what he had written from $\mu\epsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$ in addition to that statement & as an amplification of the same." Hofmann. "This word thus takes together the entire instructive

part & includes in itself the whole practical part. "Sober." The Pauline ethics of necessity follow out of the Pauline dogmatics. Or states that & nothing else. Or. Also in other Pauline Letters the didactical & exhortational parts are joined together with one another in a similar manner. G. Exh. 2:1. Τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον. The Epistle had already previously, in the third part of his Letter, which dealt with sanctification as the fruit of justifying faith, given direct admonitions to the Christian readers, 6.12, 13, 14, but these, even as the descriptions of sanctification, are regarded more generally. Now he would enter in & demonstrate the particulars of the Christian life, how the Christians have to maintain their Christianity under different circumstances & conditions in which they find themselves. He admonishes the Christians by means of the mercy of God, δὲ τὴν οἰκτιρῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The plural in such abstracts corresponds not only to the Hebrew (cf. II. D. II. 1) but also to the Greek usual loquendi. His expressions also point back to the entire former presentation. What Paul had previously written in this Letter is a proclamation, an exaltation of the mercy of God, of the grace of God in Christ. And the mercy of God over against the sinners, the mercy which the Christian readers, the brethren, have experienced in themselves, & which has made them what they are, is now also the correct motive for the Christians walking. Therefore they are genuinely evangelical admonitions which are contained in this chapter & in the following, to which the believing Christians agreed willingly & joyfully to which they had been admonished. He does not say: I command you; for he was preaching to those who were already Christians & would turn the habits in the new man, who are not to be forced with orders, but to be admonished, that they willingly do what is to be done, to the sinful old man. For whoever does not do it willingly, only out of friendly admonition, is not a Christian, whoever forces it with awe, from the unwilling is no Christian, preacher & ruler, but a worldly taskmaster. A brayer of the law wages with threats & punishments; a preacher of grace entices & invites, manifest divine goodness & mercy; for he would have no unwilling workers & disagreeable services. Now whoever does not permit himself to be enticed & invited with such sweet, lovely words concerning God's mercy, sent & given to us abundantly in Christ, that he also does that with desire & love to the honor of God, to the benefit of his neighbor, is nothing, & everything is lost to him. How will he become gay and tender with love & threatenings, who does not dissolve & melt away before such fire of heavenly love & grace? It is not man's mercy, but God's mercy, which has been given to us, & which Paul would have regarded by us, to attract & move us. Letter, "Kirchenpolitik".

The Epistle admonishes the Christians, first of all to present their bodies as living, holy, God-pleasing sacrifices, τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ζῶντα, ἁγία, εὐαγεστάτα τῷ Θεῷ. That recalls the earlier admonition: "Sorget die Linder nicht herucken in euren natürlichen Sitten... sondern stellt euch selbst Gott dar, als aus dem Herzen lebendig, und eure Glieder, die auch Werkzeuge der Sündhaftigkeit sind." "Let not our members reign in your mortal body... instead yield your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, & your members as instruments"

418.
12, 1, 2.

ments of righteousness unto God" (παράσπονται ἐαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντες καὶ τὰ
μεῖρη ὑμῶν ὁμήλας δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ. 4, 12, 13. "Hellenen überdauern die Welt und die
"Rechtlichkeit" ("yield your members servants unto righteousness"), παράσπονται τὰ μεῖρη ὑμῶν ὁμήλας
τῷ θεῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν 4, 19. We have remarked above, on 4, 12, that ὡς was significant only "Self", "body", does not
designate the entire man according to body & soul, the entire person. And so also in our passage nothing else is
meant than that the Christians, as Luther has translated & explained it, should present their bodies & their
members as a sacrifice. Even the body as the organ of all habitual activity of life, as in 4, 12, 19, should be
placed into the service of God. "Weiss. Thus most of the later exegetes, for example, also Fritzsch, Meyer,
Hofmann, Gutwald, Godet & others. The presenting of the body self-evidently presupposes the resignation
of the soul of the heart to God. Still Paul mentions here only the body & does not write similarly, like above,
παράσπονται ἐαυτοὺς καὶ τὰ σῶματα ὑμῶν. or καὶ τὰ μεῖρη ὑμῶν. For he would now describe the
different forms & manners of activity of Christianity in life & conduct. He would not amplify what the present-
ation of the body & the members of the body all include in itself. Concerning the hidden, inner side of the life
of the Christian, the kernel & nerve of Christian sanctification, he had given sufficient instructions in the
third part of the Letter. The sanctified soul, the renewed will of the Christian, concerning which one can
certainly not look away entirely in a description of practical Christianity, appears in our passage
not so much as object, but much rather as subject of the presentation. The Apostle applies himself with his
admonitions to the believing, renewed "Self" of the Christian reader. It is certainly the person of the Christian
which, like the real Christian works, παράσπονται. ὅς τις is essentially synonymous with παράσπονται
τῷ θεῷ in 4, 13. The sacrifice is to be taken here not specially as a thank offering or a burnt offering, which
would be occasioned by the sin & guilt offering presented by Christ, but it here comes into consideration
only according to its general meaning, insofar as the one making the sacrifice resigns what is his own & pre-
sents the same to God. The Christian's sacrifice their bodies, in that they regard the same not as their
property, which they can govern absolutely as they please, but present them to God, place them in the service
of God. "That the Apostle calls this sacrifice a sacrifice that is living, holy, & well-pleasing to God, happens
not in contrast to the animal sacrifices of the O.T. worship, welche ja nicht von allen dem das heilige, weil
sondern alles dies in ihnen wie auch wir. What they had been in the O.T. manner, that the Christian
himself should now be in the N.T. manner in his outward life which is consecrated to God." Hofmann.
This N.T. sacrifice is, like that sacrifice, holy in the sense of being ordained by God & in the eminent sense
of the word it is living & therefore especially pleasing to God, in that man there presents the entire
life of his body to God, in that all members of the body are active, energetic & busy in the service of God.
And the presentation of this sacrifice is at the same time a reasonable service. The accusative τῷ θεῷ
in 4, 19. ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐκ νεκρῶν is an apposition to the foregoing infinitive clause. The sense is that which
Luther repeats, when he translates: welche sich ewig von uns selbst trennen. "Which in your

reasonable service"). λογικός is "vernünftig" (reasonable) in the sense of "geistig" (intellectual).

(Thus Peter in his first letter, 2, 2, calls the Gospel $\tauὸ \text{λογικὸν γάλα}$, "die geistige Milch" ("the sincere milk"). In contrast to the purely outward sacrifice of animals, both Jewish and Gentile sacrifices of animals, the sacrifice & presentation of one's own body & life is a spiritual service, in which the man, the Christian, continually meditates & considers how he has to use & rule his body & members, so that God is thereby served, so that God is thereby glorified.

The thought expressed in v. 1b is completed in v. 2: "Und stilt euch nicht diesem Weltlauf gleich, sondern gestaltet euch um" ("And be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed"). It is here reads infinitives, which are then still dependent upon ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς in v. 1, μὴ ὑποχθῆναι & ἐκδοθῆναι ... $\text{ἀλλὰ μεταμορφωθῆναι}$, or imperatives, μὴ ὑποχθῆναι , ἐκδοθῆναι ... $\text{ἀλλὰ μεταμορφωθῆναι}$. It makes no difference in the sense. Σχημα , like ἔχουσιν , derived from ἔχειν , means *habitus*, "Haltung" (demeanor), "Selbstsein" (conduct). ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς is form, outward form corresponding to the essence & character of a person or of a thing. ὁ αἰὼς οὗτος is the present course of time or course of this world, which is evil, πονηρός , Gal. 1, 4, "bears the character of immorality," for it is $\text{ὁ αἰὼς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου}$, Eph. 2, 2, the time which is allotted to this world, when God still permits the wickedness of men to continue,

(when the devil has his work in the children of unbelief, as the devil is then called $\text{ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου}$ in 11 Cor. 4, 4. To this present period of time the Christians, who are inwardly delivered from the same, but who still live in this time & world, should not conform themselves, should not conduct themselves as the times bring with themselves, should not adapt themselves to the evil habits, customs & practices which apply & prevail at the time in the world. They should much rather transform themselves, conform their life & conduct otherwise than it had been previously conformed, when they were still $\text{ὑιοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου}$ (Luke 16, 8), children of this time. "The Christians should not behave himself so & for bear, so that he does not separate himself from the present time which exists under the exercising of power by Satan, but should transform himself out of the appearance, which he had given as a follower of the latter, into another." Hofmann. This transformation must extend through the entire Christian life, for the Christian also still bears in himself something of the oldness, since flesh & sin still cling as to the Christian. The change of the outward life & conduct, however, takes place from the inside out, as this is also the case with that presentation of the body, v. 4, which was designated as a reasonable service. It takes place thru the constant renewing of the mind, $\text{ἡ ἀνακαίνισις τοῦ νοῦς}$.

ἑμῶν . The tendency of this inward renewal is given with the words: $\text{εἰς τὸ δοκῆναι ὡς ἡμεῖς, τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθόν καὶ ἡ ἀρεσκον καὶ τὸ εὐαρεσκον}$. Many expositors take these adjectives in the substantive sense, "das Gute" etc. It appears to us more simple to translate with Luther: "das einig güte, welches das sei der gute und wohlgefallige und wohlkommene Gotteswille" ("That ye may prove what is that good & acceptable, & perfect, will of God"). The natural man asks only

420.
12,3-5.

about that which pleases him, what does good to the flesh. A Christian, who is inwardly renewed, whose mind & heart is inclined towards God, & who in this sense is renewed daily, proves & investigates continually what the will of God is, what God would ever now have of him in the foregoing case, what is pleasing to God under the prevailing circumstances & conditions. Even to that "the perfectness" of the divine will refers itself, that the Christian in all situations of life, in all circumstances & conducts himself ever against every one as it is proper for a Christian, as it is right & good before God. What God would have from us He has really revealed to us in His Word in the Law. But the application of the Law to the concrete relationships demands a conscientious proving, a sharpened & exercised mind, a mind that is at home with God & in divine things. The result of the continual renewal & proving is then that a Christian also does all that which he recognizes as good & well pleasing to God & puts into practice the will of God. A conduct corresponding to the divine will & good pleasure in all connections is the correct manner of the life of the Christian, while the children of this time permit themselves to be moved in all their actions only by their own unaided mind & will by their inborn lusts & desires. And therefore also this presentation of one's own body & life to God, this reasonable service, i.e., consists in this that a Christian with all his achievements of his body & its members, with all that which he does with the life of his body fulfils the good, acceptable & perfect will of God. Certainly in this I should not be lost sight of, that as the Apostle Paul states in essence, also with the most advanced Christians the achievement still remains far behind the willing.

Vv. 3-8.

With the words "Now ye do etc." in v. 3 the Epistle begins to specialize & thereby to explain the general admonitions in vv. 1, 2. A survey of the section, v. 3-7, shows that it deals with the different gifts of grace, gifts, and, which come into use in the Christian congregational life, & that their chief point of all admonishes the Christians, within the congregation, to give practical proof of their Christian mind thru the right use of the gifts which God has granted & to fulfill His good, acceptable will of God. He directs this admonition to the Christians 2d. 175, 180, 195, 197, 200, thus the grace or by virtue of the grace which is given to him. The experiential grace or gift of grace, which Paul had received, was his apostolic office. Cf. 1, 5; 1, 6; Eph. 3, 2. That authorized & obligated him not only to teach the Christians from among the Gentiles, but also to lead them as God's saving conduct. Thus he now needs good use of this gift by the fact that he pointed out to the Corinthians something certain had to apply the gifts granted to him by God.

Die Luthersche Kirche hat die "eigene Welt, die uns umgibt" nicht "überwunden", hat sie "amoralisch" gemacht, für every Christian hat sie nicht, was "über" steht, was "über" ist, "über" ist, "über" ist, "über" ist, "über" ist.

σωφροσύνῃ. The "Paronomasia" ὁπορευ, ἰσὺς ὁπορευ, σωφροσύνῃ we cannot repeat in the German in exactly the same manner, most easily, however, as in the above translation: "Darauf nicht höher denken, als sich gebührt zu denken" ("not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think"). A Christian should not permit his thoughts to go higher, not to think higher, which means according to the context, not to think & regard himself higher than is proper, not to go above the correct measure, but much rather to be considerate of a discreet manner of thinking. Σωφροσύνῃ, σωφροσύνη is a healthy, discreet, sober manner of thinking, a mind, which includes modesty & knowledge of self in itself. The correct measure of self-assessment is given in the words: ἕκαστος ὡς ὁ ἑῷς ἐπέβλεψε μέρους τῆς χάριτος. ἕκαστος ὡς according to Greek usage is as much as ὡς ἕκαστος. Cf. 1 Cor. 7, 17. Everyone should think of & regard himself thus, as God has imparted to everyone the measure of faith; then he is discreet. The old Greek expositors, Chrysostomus, Theodoros, Theophylact, & also Protestant expositors, like Keener, Brang, Calvin, & Grotius take this as identical with χάρις, χάρις, μέρους. Still there are different concepts. Several modern exegetes arrive at the same sense, in that they take τὸ, μέρος as a measure of charismatic talents & understand τῆς χάριτος as a *genitivus partitivus* or also *subiecti*, and thus, μέρους τῆς χάριτος concerning their own measure of gifts in the faith. Keener: "The

charismata themselves, resp. the individual charismata are to be designated as μέρους τῆς χάριτος, not in order to be differentiated from the greatness of the faith, but... as the range & scope of the application of faith especially allotted by God & measured to decide, for the same, how far in what measure, & according to which course he has applied himself to the same in the congregation." Hodet: "μέρους τῆς χάριτος is the ability given to each one in the sphere of faith the special form of activity for which each one has been made fit in his conditions as a believer; the special gift which makes up his dowry on the strengths of his faith." Similarly Hofmann. But τὸ, μέρος, as we call special attention to the fact, for itself alone cannot designate the measure of talents, and τῆς χάριτος, in connection with, μέρος, as also most of the expositors have acknowledged presents itself of itself as a *genitivus partitivus*. In another passage, Eph. 4, 7, the apostle will speak of a measure of the gifts of Christ: Ἐν ᾧ ἑκάστῳ ἡμεῖς ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέρος τοῦ δωρεᾶς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. In our passage, on the other hand, he speaks expressly of a measure of faith, of a special measure of faith, which God has imparted to every Christian. To every individual Christian God has allotted a definite measure in faith, thus to different Christians a different measure. The words declare this & nothing more. Therefore certainly the *fides salvifica* cannot be meant with τῆς χάριτος, the trust in the grace of

God in Christ, as, for example, Frutychius & Meyer also take it. That God imparts the justifying, saving faith in a different measure among men is taught nowhere else in the Scriptures. If a Christian is weak in faith, he is not in his own guilt & not a lack of the grace of God. Thus the Scripture speaks of faith also in the customary sense of the word only, that God works this same, Eph. 4, 7; Col. 2, 6 or even Col. 1, 12, but never that God "quanteilt", μέρει δέει, it. No, the τῆς χάριτος of which Paul speaks is not the faith

function corresponding to his membership. But the Apostle does not write simply $\omega\delta\lambda\eta$, but $\alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omega\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta$, and with that gives the Christian to consider at the same time that they are mutual members one of another, therefore every Christian is called to serve the other members of the congregation.

What concerns the structure of the following sentence, vv. 3-5, the last expressions, $\epsilon\upsilon \epsilon\pi\lambda\omicron\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\epsilon\upsilon \epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\epsilon\upsilon \epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, "in *simplicitate*" ("with simplicity"), "mit *Eifer*" ("with diligence"), "mit *Freudigkeit*" ("with cheerfulness"), are evidently of a parenthetical character & therefore about the foregoing designation introduced with $\epsilon\upsilon$ are not to be taken otherwise. Therefore with most of the expositors we take $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\nu\ \alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\alpha$, etc., as elliptical statements of admonition, which easily supply themselves. But then the participial designations $\epsilon\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\nu\ \chi\alpha\rho\iota\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \delta\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \delta\iota\delta\omicron\gamma\alpha\varsigma$, which continues in $\epsilon\iota\epsilon\ \eta\pi\alpha\delta\eta\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ and $\epsilon\iota\epsilon\ \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\alpha\nu$, cannot be joined with the foregoing $\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon$, which because of the $\delta\epsilon$ would be very stiff in itself and would stamp the entire statement in vv. 3-5 as a plain expression, but must be understood as the prooemium of the following multi-membered admonition. With this the Apostle again takes up the previously expressed thoughts, in order to add on the intended demands. With Frutze, Olshausen, Meyer, Pliny, Hofmann,

Indet & others we let a new sentence begin with $\epsilon\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon$, whose content would be decided in short in the following manner: In that we have different gifts in conformity with the measure of grace which has been given to us, let us also use them in conformity with their designation in a correct manner. Paul had previously said that the individual Christians as members of the one body had different functions, every individual Christian having his special function. Therein lay at the same time the diverse gifts. And because that is so, that is the meaning, because every individual Christian has his special function & gift, now therefore he should also make the right use of the same. The $\delta\epsilon$, which introduces the entire sentence in vv. 3-5, is the $\delta\epsilon\ \omega\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ and joins to the previous admonition, which ends in the $\delta\omega\delta\eta\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, another admonition, thus also formed otherwise. Those expositors who find the $\delta\omega\delta\eta\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, the discretion, the prudence specified in vv. 3-5, cannot get along well with this $\delta\epsilon$. It is $\alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omega\varsigma$ in v. 5 had already pointed to the fact that every Christian is a member for the others, for the benefit of the others, & is thus called & obligated, on his part, to serve the other members of the congregation & the entire congregation with his special gifts. Lohr remarks very fittingly on v. 5: *Non idcirco imprimis agit, ut intra limites officii se quisque contineat, sed quomodo donis divinitus datis quisque*

uti debeat, docet apostolus, ut alter alterius membrum sit eique donis suis in servit et quisque eum membra $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$ administret. The disposition of the entire sentence structure in vv. 3-5 is accordingly the following. In the main proposition the fact is brought to our attention that we Christians all form one body in Christ, but as members of this spiritual body, like the members of the natural body, we have different functions or, to speak without an image, that we have different

their writings! G. 1, 2; 3, 21; 3, 29; 10, 5, 16, 17 etc. Among these prophets ex. 35 & 37, inspiration came, for the revelation. The holy men of God have spoken, being moved by the Holy Ghost, have written that which they have written upon inspiration of the Holy Spirit. 1 Pet. 1, 21; 1 Tim. 3, 16. And so their writings are the inerrant Word of God, which is normative for all times. The principle content of their prophecy is the salutary counsel of God. The prophets have prophesied of the future grace, have attested the sufferings of Christ & the glory afterward. 1 Pet. 1, 10, 11. All this also applies to the apostles of Jesus Christ, who of few in the N.T., for example, in 1 Pet. 1, 12, corroborated the prophets & in Eph. 3, 5 are themselves called prophets. Only that the apostles have proclaimed as having taken place what the prophets had attested beforehand. The Church of Christ is established on the Word of the apostles and prophets. Eph. 2, 20. But now in the N.T., especially in the Acts of the apostles & in the Pauline Letters, also prophets of another kind are mentioned, who did not stand on the same plain with the prophets of the Old Covenant & with the apostles; on the other hand, they were also differentiated from the teachers & shepherds of the congregations. And he gave some, apostles; & some, prophets; & some, evangelists; and some, pastors & teachers. Eph. 4, 11. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? 1 Cor. 12, 29. Not an office, which was ordered them, but an especial gift which was granted to them, made these men

into prophets. And this charisma of the prophets the apostle ascribes to the miracle working of the Holy Spirit. "To another (i.e. given) faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues. But all these worketh that one & the selfsame Spirit," etc. 1 Cor. 12, 7-11. These N.T. prophets imparted to the Christian congregation the prophecies which indicated new demands of the kingdom of God, for example, with regard to the sending out of Barnabas & Paul for mission work, Acts 13, 1-3; they proclaimed coming events, for example the imprisonment of Paul, Acts 21, 4, 9-11; they revealed the hidden things of the heart, 1 Cor. 14, 24, 25. In the passages quoted it is expressly stated that the Holy Ghost spoke through them. Still there were occasional expressions of the gift of prophecy. The usual function of the Christians who were gifted with this charisma was that they built up the Christian congregation in the public assemblies with their discourses, instructions, & admonitions. 1 Cor. 14, 3. They were not the regular teachers of the congregation; they prophesied only when the Spirit of God came upon them & gave them revelation. 1 Cor. 14, 29-31. Still the revelation which the Holy Spirit imparted through them & which marked them as prophets was some-

thing else than the solemn revelation of the salutary counsel of God, as whose voice & mediators the prophets of the Old Covenant & the apostles of the New Covenant had been called, & which is laid down in the writings of the prophets & apostles. The latter was the supposition & foundation of the former. The N.T. prophets moved with their prophecies in the sphere of the doctrine of the apostles & prophets, gave the Church closer information concerning the already known, revealed divine truths, concerning this

425.
12, 3-8.

or that point of doctrine a deeper insight into the divine mysteries. 1 Cor. 13, 2. Therefore one can also say that they promoted the understanding of the Scriptures. It is not so incorrect, when one (has defined the charisma of the $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ as a "theopneustische" speech, as a more comprehensible, glorified effusion over divine things, $\epsilon\rho\upsilon\mu\eta\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in laudes divinas (Grimm). It was something similar like that which Saul & the messengers of Saul experienced, when the Spirit of God came upon them & they prophesied. 1 Sam. 10, 10; 19, 22, 23. Nevertheless, the N. T. prophets were not inspired in the strict sense of the word, like the old prophets & the apostles. When the Spirit of God also stirred & moved them & gave them a revelation, then that which they spoke was not given to them verboten. Their understanding, $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, in their prophesying was not $\xi\kappa\alpha\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma$, "inert", "inactive", "unfruitful", as this was in the case of the speaking with tongues. 1 Cor. 14, 4. What the Spirit revealed to them, the $\theta\epsilon\omicron\mu\alpha$ which He suggested to them, they carried out in a free manner, with their own words. Therefore it could easily have happened, that they permitted also their own & erroneous things to enter into their prophecies, that a strange fire mixed itself in with the light & fire from above. The elevated pitch, into which the Spirit of God transplanted them, could change over & degenerate into natural, fleshly enthusiasm. Therefore the Apostle admonishes the Christians to judge & to prove the prophecy which they received, self-evidently according to the one norma normans, the writings of the prophets, the proclamation of the Apostles. 1 Cor. 14, 29; 1 Thess. 5, 20, 21. And now in our passage, 1 Cor. 12, 6b, we cannot take $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ otherwise than in the quoted parallel passages. The charisma of prophecy with which the Roman congregation was gifted was certainly the same which was found in the other Christian congregations, like Thessalonica, Ephesus & so forth.

And now the Apostle admonishes the Christians who possess the charisma of prophecy to use the same $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, im Verhältnis zum Glauben ("according to the proportion of faith"). The old Protestant expositors, who identify the prophecy with the interpretation of the Scriptures, & also some modern ones, who understand under the $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ "the gift of more elevated speech of teaching, comfort, & admonition" in conformity with the use of language, as for example, Philippi, here take $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ as fides, quae creditur, as a doctrine of faith. Still it is very questionable whether $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is used in the N. T. in this objective sense. In the passages which one introduces for this, one comes out very well with the usual subjective interpretation. When it reads in Gal. 1, 23: $\delta\tau\iota$ & $\sigma\iota\kappa\iota\omega\nu$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ $\nu\upsilon\nu$ $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\varsigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ τῇ $\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$, $\eta\upsilon$ $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\theta\epsilon\iota$, then that is not to be understood otherwise than that Paul himself now preached, ~~so~~ one must believe in Christ, while previously he had persecuted the Christians for the sake of their faith & sought to draw them away from their faith. When we read in Gal. 3, 25: $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\gamma\epsilon$ $\sigma\epsilon$ τῇ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\sigma\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$, $\epsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\varsigma$ $\omega\epsilon\nu$, "But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster, then there faith is only personified. The N. T. economy or ordinance of salvation is near, which is character-

istic of the faith in Christ, & which is constricted to the economy of the Law. Evidently $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in v. 25

(is to be taken even as in v. 24: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." Even to this N. I. ordinance have those prior to subjected themselves, of whom it is said in Acts 6, 7, that they became obedient to the faith $\epsilon\upsilon\eta\gamma\alpha\gamma\alpha\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ $\tau\eta$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$. And when the Apostle, Jude in his Letter admonishes the Christians, in v. 3, to fight for the faith, one delivered to the saints, then Hofmann very correctly points this expression to the way of salvation ordained by God. Nevertheless it also establishes the case that $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in these passages & also in our passage designates the content of faith, the doctrine of faith, therefore the mode of expression $\kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\eta$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$; at all offerers a weighty difficulty. The old theologians understood this expression thus: Whoever possesses the gift of prophecy should prophesy in congruentia cum doctrina fidei. Thus, for example, Calov, Wolf, Lange, &c. With Luther together with the objective interpretation there is also the subjective interpretation of $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$. In his sermon on Rom. 12, 1 ff. in the "Epistel postille." But then if one would not deny the one norma normans, one is obligated to identify the doctrine of faith with the Scriptures, as one has also done it. And that is difficult to justify grammatically. And finally it is inadmissible, that as this has also happened, one detach $\acute{\alpha}\nu\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma$ from its connection with $\kappa\alpha\tau'$ and designate the analogia fidei as a congruence or harmony,

in which the individual articles of faith stand with one another. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma$ in profane Greek designates the proportion, especially the mathematical proportion. $\kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma$ means "in Verhältniss", "according to the proportion," nothing else. A thing, however, stands in proportion only to another thing, not to itself. Therefore it can only be meant that the prophecy should stand in proportion to the faith, but never that the faith stands in proportion to itself, or the different parts of faith to themselves. With most of the modern expositors we take $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in our passage, as otherwise thought in the Scriptures, as fides, quæ creditur, but certainly not as the fides, scilicet, in the sense that the prophecy had to measure itself according to the contents of faith of the prophets or also of the hearers (Hofmann, Kerdol), but in the same sense as in $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$, v. 3. Also to the one who prophesied God had imparted with His gift at the same time a corresponding measure of faith, trust, & confidence. And so the one prophesying should prophesy in proportion to this faith of his, should manifest his confidence of faith in his prophecy. The admonition of the Apostle runs thus: Firmos fides... officere debuit, ut prophetas fidenter, studiose, graviter, quacumque spiritus & sub-

ministrationem, preferent, ergo n. e. subtilissima homines docerent, gravissimam adhortarentur. Frutze. The one prophesying should always be conscious of this & be certain of this, that the Spirit of God would speak through him, & therefore be considerate of the fact that in his discourse he should seek to bring correctly to expression, to make clear & to attest powerfully, confidently that which the Spirit would now say to the congregation through him. Thereby it is given & established at the same time that he should renounce his own wisdom, the pomp & splendor of words, all straining after effect, and avoid an unwholesome pathos, to which the elevated tone can very easily lead him. Self-evidently in the imparting of

his revelation he always has to keep in view the revelation $\kappa\alpha\tau'\epsilon\sigma\chi\eta\nu$, the Word & scripture of the prophets & apostles as the rule & standard of his instruction & encouragement. This latter how-
ever, the apostle would not inculcate in our passage. Much rather in the foregoing section he lays all
emphasis on the fact that the prophet should correctly use & exercise his charisma for the benefit and
in the interest of the congregation.

Prophecy is the single extraordinary charisma which is mentioned in our Letter concerning
glossology, for example, the speaking with tongues, there is nothing said here. The Roman con-
gregation was evidently not so richly provided with miraculous gifts as, for example, the Cor-
inthian congregation, as in general these donna spiritus extraordinaria appear to have been
discontinued in the later apostolic times, in that the Christian congregations always became more
accustomed to the regular proclamation of the Word through the called teachers & shepherds of the con-
gregation as the principle means of edification. The latter the apostle considers in the following
members of the sentence, Zu den Charismaten, von denen er von v. 3 ab handelt, rechnet er
auch die von Gott gestifteten Ämter und Dienste, die ja Befähigung und Begabung fürs den
betreffenden Dienst voraussetzen zu haben. In v. 7a he writes $\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \sigma\iota\chi\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\varsigma$,
scil. $\epsilon\chi\sigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. We translate: "sei es, dass wir ein Amt haben" and thus takes $\sigma\iota\chi\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\varsigma$ in
the general sense of "Amt", "Dienste", not specially as a designation of the service of the almoners.
The change of construction, that Paul continues in v. 7b $\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \delta\ \sigma\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\omega\nu, \epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \delta\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\omega\nu$,
"ist es der Lehrende" ("or he that teacheth, or teaching"), "ist es der Ermahnende" ("or he that exhort-
eth, or exhortation"), explains itself best of all, when one subordinates the two latter concepts
under the $\sigma\iota\chi\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\varsigma$ and takes them as the two species of the churchly office. It is basically one
office, which God has established for the Church of all times, the office of the Word, & its principle func-
tions are the public teaching & admonition, which are also imparted privately to the individual Christi-
ans & the Christian families in their homes. At the time of the apostle the presbyters exercised the
latter collectively; the former by those presbyters who were instructors, 1 Tim. 3, 2, who worked espe-
cially in the Word & doctrine. 1 Tim. 5, 17. Under our conditions it is the congregational pastor who
oversees the twofold service, the preaching & the care of souls, admonition, only that in the latter
reference the congregational elders stand by his side. And the admonition, which befalls the occup-
ant of the office, now reads in short $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\iota\chi\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\varsigma$, scil. $\omega\nu\epsilon\nu, \epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\lambda\iota\varsigma, \epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\varsigma$,
scil. $\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$. Now however God has commended an office & therein wills has granted at
the same time gifts & joy for such an office, but the office of teaching or admonition, such an one
should permit himself to be found in his office always, be active & effective therein, show all zeal and
all faithfulness, remain & continue therein, & thus promote the welfare of the congregation and all
its members. Luther has strikingly translated: "Nicht jemand in Amt, so warte er das Amt an."

Lebet jemand, so warte er der Lehre. Ermahnet jemand, so warte er der Ermahnung."

(Still not only the prophets & the teachers & shepherds of the congregation, but all Christians have a certain christianity. What the apostle says here concerning the $\pi\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ should be permitted to be said of every individual Christian according to vv. 3, 4. Thus in the last three statements in v. 3 he turns to the Christians in general. The Christians are all members among one another, one is of the others, members called to serve & benefit the others with his gifts. Every Christian in his situation is to communicate to his Christian brethren out of the greater or lesser treasury of his Christian knowledge & experience. And as it reads very generally ὁ μὲν ὁ ἄλλος , therefore also the communication of physical benefits is not really excluded. But whoever communicates should do it "in Einfalt" ("with simplicity"), simply & only in the purpose to permit a blessing to come to another, not with the secondary objective to make the most out of something for one's self, some advantage or praise or honor. Now while $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \sigma\iota\sigma\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ is an action between equals, which each one owes to the other, except that the one has what the other does not have, thus $\pi\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \theta\iota\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ are activities, in which an inequality is found, in the one case an inequality of position, in the other an inequality of circumstance. "Hofmann. Also the advantageous position which a Christian occupies, the favorable circumstance in which he finds himself is all that to him by God. According to the context we

(do not have to refer the $\pi\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \theta\iota\varsigma$ expressly & also not principally to the prophets and "their activity of the administration of the congregation," but to each & every charge, watching over, superintendence, which the higher placed one owes to his subordinates, for example, the parents to the children, the teachers to the pupils, in general, the older Christians to the younger. But whoever rules should do this "mit $\epsilon\upsilon\phi\alpha\tau\iota\alpha$ " ("with cheerfulness"), not to conduct his reign according to convenience, but to permit himself to be leaned upon, and not neglect the work entrusted to his care. And whoever finds himself in a favorable position should have mercy on the poor, needy, suffering members of the congregation, & should certainly exercise mercy and great help "mit $\chi\alpha\iota\rho\iota\sigma\mu\circ\varsigma$ " ("with cheerfulness"). "One should not be annoyed over having to do something for them, but should be happy in love to be permitted & to be able to do something for them." Hofmann.

Vv. 9-21.

To the instruction to communicate, to have mercy on the need of the suffering members of the congregation, v. 9, there joins itself very fittingly an admonition to love. $\text{Ἔχρηται ἡ ὑμῶν ἀγάπη ὡς καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, v. 9.}$

This sentence stands at the head of the foregoing section & is the summary of the following admonition. The apostle now no longer speaks of the gifts of grace & no longer especially of the congregational life, but in general concerning the conduct of the Christians one against their fellow Christians & their fellow men, and this admonition is in love. Love should be unfeigned, sincere, coming from the heart. No such love without falseness, which aims at the true welfare of the neighbor, however, it belongs that one hates, detests the evil

430.
12, 9-21.

in the neighbor & consequently also upbraids it, so that he leaves off from it, & loves, recognizes, & promotes the good in the neighbor. In this sense there adds itself to the principle clause a subordinate clause: $\epsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\gamma\ \rho\acute{o}\nu$, $\kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \epsilon\gamma\chi\theta\tilde{\epsilon}\nu$. "indeclinable das large haast und dem buten onhangt" ("abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good"). Now there follow short, concise sentences, adjectives, & participles, which designate the characteristics & the conduct, wherein love manifests itself. The datives in these statements are for the most part datives of relation. We cannot copy this brevity in the German (or English) and use the imperative in the translation. $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \phi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\gamma\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \phi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\upsilon\omicron\iota$. "Hinsichtlich der Bruderliebe seid gegeneinander hebräisch." ("Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love"). V. 10. What concerns the brotherly love, the love for the fellow Christians, thus should the Christians love one another sincerely & tenderly, like blood-relatives, parents and children love one another. They are spiritually related to one another; they have the same spirit & faith. And this bond is firmer & stronger & joins the Christians together more closely than the bond of blood-relationship joins the members of a family together. But with such heartfelt love respect should be combined. $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \tau\omega\tilde{\omega}\ \epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\gamma\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\pi\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$. The Christians should honour one another & regard one another as fellow-partakers of the same grace & therefore one should regard the other as higher than himself. Thus we take the $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$ with Erasmus, Brolius, Koppe, Hofmann, & Godel. Since $\tilde{\omega}\ \gamma\epsilon\tau\omicron\theta\alpha\iota$ also means "achten" (regard), "meinen" (suppose), "dafür halten" (to hold as an opinion), thus combined with $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron$ it can mean also "norgziehen" (praise), "höher achten" (regard more highly). The more complete expression reads: $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\gamma\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \tilde{\omega}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\ \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\ \epsilon\gamma\chi\theta\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon$. Phil. 2, 3. Philippis, Meyer, Weiss, & others translate: Take the lead over another, namely, with a good example. But one does not see, why the good example should be mentioned here instead of the exercising of the good. And in the Greek wherever $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\gamma\gamma\epsilon\tau\omicron\theta\alpha\iota$ is ~~always~~ used in the sense of leading or preceding, it is combined with the genitive or dative.

Nevertheless love should not only rest in the feeling, but should show itself in action. "Was den Eifer betrifft, seid nicht lässig" ("not slothful in business"). V. 11. The Christians should be diligent, not careless, to render all sorts of service to the brothers. And this diligence, if it is of the right kind, must come from within, cannot degenerate into outward many-sided activity: "Seid brünstig, was den Geist anlangt" ("fervent in spirit"), or as we say: "im Geist." This fervent zeal, however, should be coupled with calm deliberation. We should not rush in hastily, but "den Zeitchemen" (P. V. "erving the Lord"), suit ourselves to the times & circumstances, examine the times & circumstances, & measure our action, our service accordingly. Inconsiderate zeal can only do harm. We accept the reading: $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\tilde{\omega}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, even tho' the other reading: $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ has more witnesses for itself, & certainly from inner grounds, because it fits well into the context, while such a far-away admonition like this, to serve the Lord, would be very unsuitable in the sphere of these.

special admonitions. There follow in v. 12 admonitions which are occasioned by τῶ κριπῇ Σοφείοντες,

(which nevertheless concern not the brotherly love but in particular the Christian conduct in ~~difficult~~ difficult times: "Hinsichtlich der Hoffnung seid frohlich" ("Rejoicing in hope"), in that you rejoice over your great & beautiful hope. "Hinsichtlich der Drangsal," which would say, in the presence of tribulations, "seid geduldig" ("patient in tribulation"). "Haltet an am Betel" ("continuing instant in prayer"), which breaks through & overcomes the pressure of tribulation. The following statements, which return again to the brotherly love, vv. 13-14, join themselves likewise to the admonition, "during the times". Love should take into consideration the different conditions & nature of the brethren and adapt its services accordingly. "Nehmet auch der Heiligen Theil an," exactly according to the original text: "Nehmet Theil an dem Bedürfnissen der Heiligen" ("Participating to the necessity of the saints"), in that you make them your own & satisfy them by active help. And even also exhort, homelike fellow-believers one should help, "der Gastfreundschaft nachgehen" ("given to hospitality"). The mention of the strangers brings with itself the mention of the enemies. "Segnet, die euch verfolgen, segnet und fluchet nicht" ("Bless them which persecute you: bless, & curse not"). Still that is only a passing & preliminary remark, which is taken up again in v. 17. The Christian brethren the Apostle has

in mind again when he writes further: "Freuet euch mit den Frohlichen und weinet mit den Weinenden" ("Rejoice with them that do rejoice, & weep with them that weep"), show your heartfelt interest to those that rejoice, as to those that weep. "Seid gegen einander gleichgesinnt" ("Be of the same mind one toward another"), τὸ αὐτό. εἰς ἄλλήλους προνοῦντες, one should intend the same thing for someone else, which he looks for from him under similar conditions. "Trachtet nicht nach hohen Dingen" ("Mind not high things"), which go over the head of someone else & are useful to no one, sondern haltet euch herab zu den Niedrigen" ("but condescend to men of low estate"), really: let yourself go along with the lowly, τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συνπαύσασθε, in that you enter into their situation, their necessities, their power of comprehension, be weak with the weak. The last & most heart-point of brotherly love is: "Seid nicht klug bei euch selbst" ("be not wise in your own conceits"). "Don't consider yourself wise." Do not always follow your own head, but let yourself be instructed by others, even lesser brethren. That comes for our benefit, & so we make use of others, gain their confidence, gain influence over them, when they see that we at times accept instruction & counsel from them.

After the Apostle has called attention to the principle phases of brotherly love, at the end of the chapter, vv. 17-21, he still considers the general love, that which the Christians owe to all men, even those who are outside. And since they have nothing to expect, no good but only evil from the non-Christians who are hostile to God & to Christ, therefore he here places at the head the admonition: "Vergeltet nicht Böses mit Bösem" ("Recompense to no man evil for evil"). Instead of permitting themselves to be enticed to evil by evil, they should rather seek after good things & peace also in their associations with the

und hebreer. *Προσούμωσθε καὶ τὸ ἐν ὁμίῳ πέντε ἑν ὅμιλῳ*: thus it reads with allusion to Prov. 3,4. That would say: consider the good, think of a moral & honorable conduct, so that this good thing might be open before the eyes of all men, before your entire environment as such. Theophylact correctly refers καὶ τὸ ἐν ὁμίῳ to τὸ ἕκαστον ὁμιλίῳ καὶ ἑπὶ ὁσὶ κοινόν. And "haltet mit allen in euerem Frieden" ("live peaceably with all men"). Certainly Paul here adds to that: εἰ δυνατόν, "wenn möglich" ("if it be possible"), and acknowledges with that, that the objective impossibility of the εἰρηνεύειν comes into play, namely there, where truth, right, & duty demand a fight. Looking away from this case, the Christians of themselves, on their part, τὸ εἰς ἑμῶν, should be prepared for peace. With that it is certainly not excluded that the other start wars without any reason & defeat our peaceful purposes & efforts. Once again the Epistle hinders, & certainly very emphatically & actively, the recognition of evil, in that he addresses his readers with ἀγαπᾷ τοὶς. "Achtet euch selbst nicht, beliebt, sondern gebet Raum dem Herrn" ("Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath"). The meaning, be it their own wrath or the wrath of the enemy that is meant, needs no separate interpretation in view of the quotation, Deut. 32,35: "Mein ist die Rache, ich will vergelten, spricht der Herr" ("To me belongeth vengeance, & recompense"). Be the ἡ χάρις, is the divine favor & grace, 5,17, so the wrath of God is designated simply as ἡ ὀργή or ἡ ὀργή ἡ ἐργαζομένη ἡ μέλλουσα (ὀργή, 5,9; 1 Thes. 2,16; 1,10; Matt. 3,12). We Christians should give room, free scope to the wrath of God, permit Him to rule & go on as He will, instead of entrenching upon His rights by private revenge. Nevertheless before the final wrath breaks out over our adversaries, who are also adversaries of God & of Christ, as long as we still live with our adversaries along the way, we should make ourselves appear to them & cause them to change their opinion. Out of the renouncing of personal revenge there follows (ὁὖν) the other thing: "Wenn nun dein Feind Hunger, so speise ihn; wenn ihn Durst ist, so trinke ihn. Denn wenn du das thust, wirst du feurige Kohlen auf sein Kopf sammeln" ("If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head"). Paul here speaks with the words of the C. L. Prov. 25,21. The glowing coals are an image of the veritas penitentiae gemilias. Nulla est enim maior invitatio ad amorem, quam praevincere amando. Augustine. Thus most of the expositors. "So little as one can remain incensed to glowing coals upon the head, so little shall the enemy, who receives good deeds for evil deeds, be able to remain incensed to them, so that he shall not become agitated over that which he has done & acknowledge his unwrighteousness & repent." Hofmann. He must be almost completely hardened, who does not permit himself to be touched by such proofs of the love of the enemy of the Christian in which love of the enemy is reflected. The Epistle concludes his admonition to the love of the enemy with the words: "Sei dich nicht das Böse, durch welches the enemy does to you, überwinden, sondern überwinde das Böse mit Gutem" ("Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good"), "in that you bring it about

that the enemy, shamed by your highmindedness, ceases to deal evilly with you & becomes your friend." We can
 (Summary of the Chapter: The Epistle admonishes the Christians to faithful service in the congregations, to the love of the brethren & common love.

Chapter VIII.

13, 1-7. Concerning Obedience to the Rulers.

From the relationship of the Christians to their fellowmen in general the Apostle now in his admonitions passes over to the relationship of the Christians to the civil magistracy, which has its station in the natural human sphere. For the assumption that the foregoing admonition to obedience over against the magistracy is occasioned by a fleshly desire for freedom or by revolutionary efforts of the Roman Christians, that the rebellious mind of the Jews had first of all infected the Jewish-Christian part of the congregation, one can furnish no proof. In the extensive presentation of the Christian duties, which apply to the individual, which had begun in 12, 1, the duty over against the magistracy has its natural place. And it lay very close to Paul even to remind the Roman Christians of this, who lived in the seat of the world government & had the

misadministration in the imperial court constantly before their eyes. Above all the Apostle with this instruction of his concerning the magistracy also rejects the perverted thought, as if the Christians, the members of the congregation of God & of Christ, have absolutely nothing to do with the civil magistracy & with the essence of the state. Still that is a thought on which the Christians of all times can easily fall. And so for all times the Apostle has established the divine right & the divine dignity of the magistracy in the foregoing section. And so also, for example, Luther & with him the Lutheran Church, when it applied, always returned again to Rom. 13, 1ff., to justify the office & position of the magistracy against the papistical errors and against the errors of the Anabaptists. At the same time the Apostle has indicated exactly for the civil magistrates their boundaries. He has here amplified the word of Christ: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; & unto God the things that are God's." Luther & remarks on Rom. 13, 1-7: "The basic truth of the righteousness of faith, which points the inner personal relationship to God as the sphere in the Kingdom of God, enables the Apostle to distinguish correctly between two spheres & thus also to find the correct outer relationship to the divinely ordained legal procedure of the human community life in the state & to guarantee it for all times. And if thru the obscuring of that basic truth in the course of time also this truth has been obscured for the

Christian conducting of life, then it needs only the renewal of that Pauline verdict in order to bring the position of the Christian to the state community into light again & into application. That is the great historical significance which the foregoing section of the Letter to the Romans has. If the Reformation in general is the renewed assertion of this Letter, then especially also this passage in the same in connection with the thoughts of Luther has gained a new meaning. Often enough the German Reformer in his renewed

434.
13, 1-2.

appreciation of the magistracy & of civil community life returns to the apostolic instructions."

The section begins with the words: $\pi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\varsigma\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\upsilon$. ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ designates here, as in 1 Pet. 3, 20, the individual person; $\pi\alpha\sigma\epsilon\varsigma\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$ accordingly corresponds exactly to the German "Jedermann". "Jedermann soll unterthun sein dem Gewalt, die übergeordnet ist" ("Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers"). The supreme power of the state is meant, which we usually call "Obrig-keit", authorities. The expression $\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ applies not only in abstracto to the governmental office, but to the magistracies according to their concrete persons & members as the bearers of the God-ordained office." Meyer To that also the plural $\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ points. Philipp: "The plural $\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in our passage compre- hends the entire governmental power in its heterogeneous formations & organizations, cf. 1 Pet. 2, 13, 14; Tit. 3, 1—higher & lower officials, also the local authorities. In the rubric $\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ falls every kind and form of governmental power, the republican as well as the monarchical. The setting over, the $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ of the magistrate consists in the fact that the same gives laws, orders, concludes ordinances, & executes the laws, & the subjection consists in the fact that one obeys & follows the governmental laws & ordinances. The motive for the obedience over against the magistracy is given in 1b and 1c. $\text{Ὅτι γὰρ ἔστιν ἑβούλη ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ}$. The sense remains the same when one reads $\upsilon\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma$ instead of $\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$. We translate exactly: "Dem existiecht Obrigkeit ohne non Gott", and not: "Dem exist keine Obrigkeit ohne non Gott" (for there is no power but of God). In the latter case this sentence would already state the same thing as the following. The meaning is, that in general there is not & there would be no government, that government would not be possible & would not be conceivable, if it did not originate from God. No power on earth could only in some measure hold in bounds the wickedness & unrighteousness of men, who seek to do injury to one another & to ruin one another without restraints, if the strong arm of God did not stand behind it. The following statement brings only a heightening: $\alpha\iota\ \sigma\epsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\rho\upsilon\mu\epsilon\chi\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \iota\upsilon$. "Die (Obrigkeiten) aber, welche da sind, die sind non Gott geordnet" ("The powers that be are ordained of God"). The citizen of the land, also a Christian, does not need to ask & to investigate, first, whether the magistracies, which are set over him, have come into their offices by right or by injustice. It does not treat of the fact, whether a government is valid, but simply of the fact, whether it exists at all. The actual condition, $\tau\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \epsilon\tau\iota\ \gamma\alpha\rho$, the factual possession of the power is decisive. Every government on earth, no matter if it might be illegal, which de facto has the rule in its hand and carries out the functions of the government, is a government ordained by God. And therefore because the governmental office in general is originated by God, therefore every one, also every Christian, should be subject to the government, in whose provinces he lives. And therefore whoever resists the government, resists the ordinance of God, 12a; "die aber widerstehen, widerstehen selbst einbrut dem ewigen" ("and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation"), $\epsilon\delta\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \iota\eta\ \psi\omicron\rho\tau\iota\varsigma$. 12b. Hereby we have to consider not only governmental exactions, but the manifold judgments of God, which rebels have

drawn down upon themselves. History teaches in many examples that rebels have cast themselves into
(misfortune & have often come to an end with terror.

Οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαὶ οὐκ ἔστι φάβοι τῷ ἁγίῳ. Ἐργῶν, ἀλλ' ἰ τῷ κκκν. v. 3. That is the most substantiated reading "Nenn die Herrschenden sind nicht dem guten Werk zur Furcht, sondern dem Bösen" ("For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil"). We do not take this statement, as many expositors do, as a confirmation of the ἐὰς τοῖς κριμαῖς ἡ γ' ἡγοῦται. For it is forced to restrict the κριμαῖς to the governmental punishment, and τὸ κκκν ἔργων, "Böses thun", includes more in itself than insubordination. The statement in v. 3a together with the following, forms a closely woven sentence structure, & the entire sentence structure in vv. 3-4 is joined to the foregoing section, vv. 1-2, by γὰρ. The Apostle here gives further reasons for the principle thought, his admonition to obedience over against the magistracy, which includes in itself a warning against disobedience, in that he now calls attention to the purpose for which God has ordained the magistracy. The rulers are above all φάβοι, the magistracy is & remains a matter of constraint & opposition to fear. Still only he who does evil has to fear the magistracy & their punishment, not the one who does good. Selfunderstandably the discussion here is concerning the doing of good & the doing of evil in the common human sphere, according to a general human concept of judgment, concerning the justice civilis on the one hand & manifest, gross un-

righteousness, which makes men civilly infamous, on the other hand. "Willst du dich aber vor der Obrigkeit nicht fürchten, so thue das Gute" ("Willst du nicht befürchten der Mächte? & do that which is good"). You hold it unworthy for yourself as a Christian to be afraid before men. Now then, do only that which is good, as it is become you as a Christian, & devote yourself to benevolence over against everyone; then you do not have to fear the powers, but shall much rather "Lob von ihm haben" ("have praise of the same"), the praise of a good citizen & subject. For they are in general "Gottes Diener in dir zu gut" ("the ministers of God to thee for good"), ordained by God for the purpose of showing good to you who do that which is good, of protecting and defending you. "Wenn du aber das Böse thust" ("But if thou do that which is evil"), & certainly thereby also deny your Christianity, "so fürchte dich" ("be afraid"). Denn sie trägt das Schwert, nicht umsonst ("For he beareth not the sword in vain"). The sword, ἡ μάχαιρα, among the Greek & Romans was the insigne of the holder of power, which he had borne before himself in ceremonial processions, & is at all times an emblem of the magistracy. The power of the state is climaxed in the jur gladii, in the power over life & death, in general in the power of punishment. The N.T. confirms the ordinance which God had established of old for the generation of man in Noah's day that whoever sheds man's blood shall his blood be shed by man. Yes, God Himself has placed the sword into the hand of the magistracy, they are "Gottes Diener in Rache und Zorn zu sein an dem der Böse nicht brunt" ("the ministers of God, revengers to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil"). Ἐν σικρῷ, εἰς ὅπως τῷ τῷ κκκν. τ. π. 1. 1. That is the purpose of the magistracy, of this divine ordinance. All magisterial functions, giving of the law, carrying out of the law, & punishment of the transgressors of the law, the evil-doers & the offenders, without which the law would be a dead letter, aims for, come to the point

436.
13, 1-7.

that the excesses of the evil men are so far held down that the general peace, the public ordinance & welfare is not endangered. Even in this manner are the good citizens & subjects protected & made secure. And this salutary purpose of the magistracy is basis enough for the Christians to be subject. This purpose is also otherwise in general realized where the rulers exercise their rulership with despotism & misuse it for their own advantage, where one with right accuses the officials of corruption. This is the way of our Lord God, as Luther so often called attention to the fact, that He rules the world, which is full of evil knowers, by evil knowers & holds it in bounds. A righteous, wise prince, a just, wise magistracy, as Luther says, is "a wise raven; a blessing which is comparatively seldom given to superiors. But even without such garnishing the Christians are satisfied & thankful, if only in their place the public ordinance is maintained upright in some measure by the magistracies & the police, so that they can carry out a quiet, peaceful life in all godliness & honesty, so that they can carry out their work in peace, can build their Kingdom, the Kingdom of God. The Christians serve themselves, serve their own cause, the cause of their God, when they render to the emperor, even as Nero, what the emperor is, & through obedience, civil virtue & honesty strengthen & promote the office of the magistracy & its functions.

In v. 5 Paul turns back to admonition. "Darius," because the government is ordained by God, in order to punish the evil-doers, to hinder wickedness, to protect the good, vv. 2-4, ist ea noth- (wenig, unterhan zu sein, nicht nur um des Zorns willen, since one still cannot withdraw oneself from the punishment of insubordination, sondern auch um des Bewissens willen. ("Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake"). The conscience of the Christians is ruled by God & God's will, & the Christians now know that the God, whom they call their God & whom the world does not know has also established the civil government & that it carries out His will in the world. Therefore they obey the magistracy for God's sake. "Reschalt," from the reason presented in vv. 2-4, "zahlet auch Steuern" ("For for this cause pay ye tribute also", v. 5 a. We take *τε δέ οὗτε* not as an indicative, but as an imperative, since the surrounding statements are of an admonishing content. The governmental apparatus, ruling, administration, administration of justice, police, military forces, etc., costs money. And the Christians should be prepared & true Christians are always willing to contribute their share, so that the government can exercise its functions. For they, the governmental personnel, are, as has been shown previously, "Gottes Diener" ("God's ministers"), *δῆτο ὑπὸς Θεοῦ*, "eben hierfür beständig thätig" ("attending continually upon this very thing"), *ἐξ αὐτῶν τούτων πρὸς κερταποῦντες*, which means, for the above-mentioned salutary purpose, with the above-named work, the restraint of evil and the protection of the devout. The little conclusion instruction & admonition which concerns the magistracy with the statement in v. 7: "Entrechtet nun nicht, was ihr schuldig seid" ("Render therefore to all things due"); "die Steuer" ("tribute"), the direct taxes, *pro colo et capite*, "wem die Steuer gebührt" ("to whom tribute is due"); "den Zoll" ("custom"), *το τέλος*, *pro mercetibus*, the indirect taxes, "wem der Zoll gebührt" ("to whom

untern"); "die Furcht, wenn die Furcht, die Ehre, wenn die Ehre gebietet" ("fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor"). The magistracy is due fear, because it bears the sword in the hand, & honor, because it is God's representative. Still the latter expression reaches further, as at the very beginning of the sentence points out the obligation over against the governmental persons. The Christians should impart to every fellow citizen, to whom honor is due because of his position, because of his civil station or because of the merit which he has won for himself because of the public benefit, the due honor & recognition.

It was not necessary for the Apostle to add a reminder & a limitation of kind to that which he had written concerning the conduct of the Christians over against the magistracy, such as, that one must obey God rather than man. Acts 5, 29. In the foregoing instruction such a limitation is given & contained of itself. If the governmental power originates in God & if the same should hinder the evil according to God's will & create room for the good, then the government evidently denies its divine authority & mission, when it would command & establish what is not lawful before God, what is evil, & then the discussion can no longer be concerning obedience & being subject, for obedience for God's sake reaches only as far as the divine & God's commands. And since the government is ordained only for the common human sphere, for the worldly kingdom, where good men & evil ones dwell, where manifestly good men dwell among one

(another, & where the evil gains the upper hand when it is not suppressed with force, therefore the government oversteps the bounds established for it by God, when it would make regulations for the Church of God & of Christ & would reign within the Church, & in this case it is the right & sacred duty of the Christians to resist the power of the state, which here no longer stands in God's place itself evidently not with force, but by refusal of that which is commanded. We enjoin our Christians, to be sure, to obey also unjust, tyrannical lords, who overstep their bounds, but only so far as also these tyrants exercise the divine functions of government. In other respects, the Christians should willingly suffer according to Christ's example the injustice which one does to them & somewhat even adds because of their supposed disobedience, & also in this case overcome the evil with the good.

The Apostle admonishes the Christians to be subject to the worldly government, since the same is ordained by God, & certainly for the salutary purpose to restrain the evil & to protect the good.

Vv. 8-10. Admonition to Love the Neighbor.

The Christians should pay to everyone that which is due him. The principle obligation over against the neighbor however, is & remains love. Therefore the Apostle again comes back to the love of the neighbor. Μη σεβι μη σεβ οβειλετε, ει μη το αλλοις αγαπατε. 1. Pa. "Seid Niemandem etwas schuldig, als das ihr euch unter einander liebt" ("Owe no man anything, but to love one another"). That means: This one thing the Christians can & should remain owing to their neighbor: love.

"Love is the one thing which one can continue owing to another, because one must continue owing it to him, because by no single payment can one fulfill this debt." Hofmann. Love is not a payment of a debt which one can pay for always, so that one is then even with his neighbor. The debt of love remains throughout one's entire life. The inexhaustibleness of the obligation of love, whose claims heap themselves up with the fulfillment, is pronounced. Meyer Weiss. Love intensifies itself through love, & the more it is exercised, so much the less can it satisfy itself. Philipp. *Letras debitor solvantur nexa moment; delictioris debitorum et solvitur et manet.* Broties. The admonition to love without ceasing is confirmed by the sentence structure in *11:1-10*. "Wer dem Andern liebt, der hat ^{erw} thereby ^{das} Gesetz erfüllt" ("for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the Law"). "Denn das: du sollst nicht ehebrechen, du sollst nicht tödten, du sollst nicht stehlen, du sollst nicht begheben, und so einander ein Gebot ist wird in dem Wort ^{as in a unit, in a summary} *zusammengeschlossen*, *2x Kεδ x δ x 07 x 1*, or, as we say in short, *zusammengefasst*: *du sollst deinen Nächsten lieben als dich selbst* ("For this, ^{Thou} shalt not commit adultery, ^{Thou} shalt not kill, ^{Thou} shalt not steal, ^{Thou} shalt not bear false witness, ^{Thou} shalt not covet, & if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, ^{Thou} shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"). The placing of the sixth commandment before the fifth is still found in Mark 10, 19; Luke 18, 20; James 2, 20. One sees from this that the Lord & His Apostles laid no importance on the numbering order of the commandments. The trouble does not pay for itself to enter into the manyfold conjectures, by which one seeks to explain the foregoing arrangement. How far the individual commandments comprehend themselves in the commandment of love to the neighbor is shown in the following sentence: "Die Liebe hat dem Nächsten nicht Böses an" ("Love worketh no ill to his neighbor"). That whoever loves his neighbor would do evil to him would be a contradiction in itself. Whoever loves his neighbor therefore avoids all those offenses which are mentioned in the commandments named, by which the neighbor is wronged. "So ist nun die Liebe des Gesetzes Erfüllnig" ("Therefore love is the fulfilling of the law"), *11:17* *ppw*, really: the fact of the present fulfillment. The Epistle here calls attention only to the negative side of love, as this negative interpretation of the Commandments brings this with itself. Self-evidently, he who does not do any evil to his neighbor also does good to him. To do neither evil nor good to the other is an absurdity. Paul in the foregoing context considers only the commandments of the second Table of the Law, because he treats only of the conduct over against the neighbor. Self-evidently, however, true love of the neighbor is present only there, where love to God has found room. The Epistle speaks only of the fulfillment of all the individual commandments, but not of the perfect fulfillment of the Law. According to that which he had written in chap. 7, 13 ff., it is understood of itself that the obedience, the fulfillment of the Law by the Christians is still very imperfect. The doing always remains behind the willing. Nevertheless, insofar as a Christian really does good, the same extends over all Commandments.

The Apostle once again admonishes the Christians to love of the neighbor, in that he emphasizes that love is the fulfillment of the Law.

Vv. 11-14. Admonition to Walk in the Light.

There follows a new admonition, which is coordinated with the foregoing by means of $\kappa\alpha\iota$. The Christians should walk in love & should walk in the light, in holiness & righteousness, which is pleasing to God. These are two principle parts of the Christian life which the Apostle often combines with one another, e.g., Eph. 5:1-9; 1 Thess. 4:1-9. From 12, 17 on Paul has in mind the relationship of the Christians to their fellow-men in general, to the non-Christian world. There it applies on the one hand, that they are to exercise love, especially love of the enemy, to subject themselves to the divine ordinance, which regulates the human, civil community; on the other hand, they are to keep themselves unspotted from the world & its evil essence. This latter he would now impress upon the Christians.

First of all, he calls their attention to the time in which they are living. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{o}\nu\ \delta\tau\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\omega\pi\omega\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\ \epsilon\acute{\varsigma}\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ V. 11a. And indeed, ~~in der~~ ~~we~~ ~~chies~~ ~~weise~~ ~~n~~, ~~näm-~~

lich die Zeit, dass die Stunde vorhanden ist, nunmehr vom Schlaf aufzustehen ("And that knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep"). etc. The $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ points expressly to the following designation of time. The Christians have knowledge of the time in which they live & with this reminds the Apostle awakens consciousness about the time, which easily obscures itself. The Christians should consider the times, not pass the time thoughtlessly, but always, as it were, see & well consider the hour hand in the Kingdom of God, what time it is & what is now in the time for them. They know & should know & not forget that the hour is at hand, now to awaken from sleep. What the figurative expressions "Schlaf", then "Finsternis", "Licht", mean, is understood of itself of sleep & awakening the Apostle also speaks otherwise, e.g., Eph. 5:14: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, & Christ shall give thee light." Similarly, 1 Thess. 5:6: "Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch & be sober." Spiritual sleep is meant, which is not essentially different from spiritual death, the sleep of sin. Sleep is the condition where man lives in his ignorance in his sins, where he goes on carelessly & carelessly in his sins. The Gentiles, the unbelievers are those who are asleep. And to awaken, to rise up from sleep, that means: to deny the former walking in sin, to regard God & God's will, & now to live holy & righteously according to God's will. The Christians, when they became Christians, have already awakened & risen up from sleep. The hour of conversion is the deciding hour, when man is converted from the darkness to light, from unrighteousness to righteousness, from the power of Satan to God. But the entire Christian life should then be a continual repentance. What has begun in the hour of conversion goes on in the daily sanctification. That is the daily business of a believing

440.
13, 11-14.

Christian, who still lives in the evil world & in the flesh, that he denies the sin to which he is continually tempted, always renews himself anew, remembers his God & the will of God, & keeps his eyes open, & guards himself well, that he is not entangled again in the former sins & lusts. And it is now time, the correct point of time is here, the hour is at hand, yes, that is the time for the Christians that in this sense they awaken out of sleep.

Now far, why it is time for the Christians to awaken from sleep, is stated by the following clause: $\nu\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \eta\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma\ \eta\ \alpha\iota\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$. V. 11b. The sense remains essentially the same, whether one combines $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ with $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\nu$ or with $\eta\ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$, whether one translates: "Das Heil ist uns jetzt näher, als da wir geglaubt wurden" or: "unser Heil ist jetzt näher, als da wir geglaubt wurden" ("for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed"). In the statement here first of all the general thought that our salvation is now nigh. But if it is nigh, still so nigh, yet it is never there. Therefore we dare not think here of the salvation which has already appeared in Christ of the N. Y. grace, which has been revealed & made manifest in the Gospel, of the day of salvation, which, for example, is described in 11 Cor. 6, 2, but the discussion is concerning the salvation which still stands to be expected, concerning the perfect salvation, the perfect blessedness, which shall be revealed on the Last Day, when Christ returns, which we shall receive on that day from the hands of our Lord, & be carried away from there as our reward. This salvation of ours is nigh, yes, nearer than when we believed when we became Christians out of Jews & Gentiles. The hypocrite would thereby say something more than that since the beginning of our Christian condition, since our conversion, since our Baptism so & so many years & days have passed, thus the Last Day the day of salvation has drawn so & so many days & years nearer. Our salvation has also come nearer to us in the sense that now nothing more lies in the midst between us & our salvation that we now have nothing else to expect than the beginning of our salvation. When we became believers, entered into the Christian condition, then first of all the great change & turning took place, the change-over out of the condition of wrath into the condition of the pleasure of God; then we were considerate above all of the fact that we were free from sin, guilt & wrath & received a gracious God, that we became believers in the intent that we would be justified thru faith in Jesus Christ Gal. 3, 16. The future salvation, as it were, stood first in a second line. Now, however, after we have become believers and have been justified by faith, we now have peace with God, our eyes are turned directly to the future, perfect salvation, which the Last Day shall bring us. Nothing any longer stands in the way of our salvation; we only await the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. 1, 7.

The following statement, which is actually "asyndetisch", is an explanation of this designation of time: $\eta\ \nu\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \sigma\iota\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \eta\ \sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \gamma\gamma\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu$. V. 12a. That means: now, present, the night is advanced, has marched far on, is already disappearing; the day has drawn near. The

point of time is indicated, when the night begins to give way & makes room for the coming day, when one can already notice it that it will be day, thus the time of the first dawning. The figure finds its interpretation in the context. The day of which the same is said, as previously of our salvation, the day which draws nearer, is the Last Day, which brings us salvation. The day, which the apostle otherwise calls "the day of wrath & revelation of the righteous judgment of God," Rom. 2, 5; "the day of Jesus Christ," Phil. 1, 6; "the day of Christ," Phil. 1, 10; "the day of the Lord," 1 Thess. 5, 2, is here & elsewhere, e.g. 1 Cor. 3, 13; 1 Thess. 5, 4, simply called "the day." The Last Day itself, the day of the return of Christ, is the beginning of salvation, of the eternal glory, the morning splendor of eternity, the resplendent dawn, & the Last Day together with that which it has as a result, together with the salvation of God, the eternal salvation, is the bright light day, which the passing night now has uncovered, to which no night shall make an end. The night which precedes this day, is the time of this world, $\sigma\alpha\iota\omega\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, 12, 2. This time is like the nighttime, is ruled by sin & death; the prince of this world now still has his work in the children of unbelief. The Christians are certainly inwardly already delivered from this night, but they also still live, walk, & do business in this evil time, in this evil world, & cry: "Hüter, ist die Nacht schier hin?" ("Watchmen, what of the night?") Isa. 62, 11. Concerning this night it is also said that it is far advanced, that it is giving way, & concerning that day that it has drawn near. That is the time in which we now live, it is the last hour. This evil time, this evil world inclines toward the end; in a little while, then everything which now harms & troubles us shall disappear, disappear forever. The morning already dawns, the day is near, the Lord is nigh; a little while, then the Lord will come & with Him His reward, His salvation.

In view of the time the Christians should "nun ablegen die Werke der Finsternis und anziehen die Waffen des Lichts" ("cast off the works of darkness, & put on the armor of light"). Because the phrase $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, etc. in v. 11a is amplified by the parenthesis in v. 11b 12a, the apodosis, which begins with the $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\iota\gamma\eta\varsigma$ in v. 12b, is introduced with $\sigma\iota\gamma\eta\varsigma$. That to which the apostle now summons the Christians is essentially the same as that which he had already pointed out with the exhortation "to awake out of sleep." The figure is now somewhat turned & further amplified. As one lays aside his night dress early in the morning, thus the Christians should lay aside, put off the works of darkness. As one puts on his clothes in the morning, in which one would walk & work during the day, as a soldier puts on his armor, in order to prepare himself for the battle of the day, so the Christians should put on the works of light. Light & darkness in the scripture is a customary designation for righteousness & unrighteousness, for example, when it reads in 1 Cor. 6, 14:

What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? Works of darkness are works of wickedness, evil works, as, for example, in Eph. 5, 11, the discussion is also concerning "the unfruitful works of darkness." Works of light are works of righteousness, good, God-pleasing works. Paul says nothing of the thing, but concerning armor of light, because the walking in the light, a moral, righteous conduct is always at the same time a battle, only unwar is continued

battle with sin does it proceed. The Christians had already laid aside the works of darkness, when they became Christians, when the old man had already been crucified Rom. 6. The Christians have already put on the clothing, the armor of light, have already entered into a new life, into a condition of good works, in the regeneration, in Baptism, since the new man is already put on Eph. 4:24. Nevertheless the Christians, because they still live in the world & in the flesh, & are hourly tempted to sin & so easily grow weak in good things, are admonished with good reason to put away from themselves continually, daily the evil works, which press upon them from the inside & from the outside & to be zealous in all good works, to continue the battle, as they are also admonished continually "to put off the old man" & to put on the new man" Eph. 4:22-24. And the reference to the time in which they live should now encourage them to deny more & more & always more completely the works of darkness & to put on the armor of light. The night is advanced, it draws to an end. The time is not distant, when God shall judge & condemn the world because of its evil works. Therefore it is the time to awaken from sleep, therefore we should not delay & in time put off all that which falls under the judgment, whereby we cannot stand in that day. The day is near at hand, salvation stands at the door. Therefore we should see what manner of persons ye ought to be in all holy conversation & godliness, looking for & hastening unto the coming of the day of God." 1 Pet. 3:11, 12, therefore we should prepare ourselves with weapons of light, that we might be "sinless & without offence," filled with the fruits of righteousness on that day. Phil. 1:10, 11.

Also the second exclamation in vv. 13, 14, which modifies the first, refers to both sides of the Christian conduct. "Lasst uns ehrbarlich wandeln als am Tage" ("Let us walk honestly, as in the day"). Here also figures & facts are interwoven with one another. The Apostle summons the Christians, figuratively speaking: to walk decorously as in the day, to withhold themselves from such things which one would really do in the darkness of the night, with which one would not go forth in the light of the day, to bring forth only such works with which one can permit himself to be seen before everyone; without figure: to walk honestly, thus to walk as it is fitting to walk in view of the day of Jesus Christ. The Christian walks, as it were, in view of the Last Day, for whose beginning they wait every day, & therefore it is fitting to walk thus, so that one might also appear before God's eyes as pure & free of offence. And now the Apostle means several shameful things which an honest Christian walking excludes, enumerates several of those works of darkness, with which a Christian should have nothing to do Mt. 15:19-20 etc. Meyer: "The datives explain themselves out of the concept of the way & manner, how the 11 & 12-ers, that is, the conduct of life should not take place." According to the German manner of speaking we give them with "in". Kuss are "Nachtwerke", "nächliche Schmausereien" (drinking), "Lustgelage" (drunkenness). Luther has put it into German well: "nicht in Trunkenheit und Lust". Kottling gives *congrasus* & *congrasus*, 26 & 27, "Saccinatalis", "Quischwifungen" (drunkenness); 28, "Hader", "Streit" (strife); 29, "Eifersucht" (envying). There are

works in which the children of the world feed themselves, who walk in the darkness of this world, with which the unbelievers fill up their existence. Their conduct takes a course in such empty actions of sensuality, sexual enjoyment, selfishness. Such works cannot endure the light of day, the light of the Last Day, because of such works the wrath of God comes upon the children of unbelief. Eph. 5, 5. When Christians consent to such works, then they have thereby denied & lost their Christianity, their faith & a good conscience. And Christians should certainly not suppose that they are absolutely above such things. The evil world in which they live seeks to draw them into the empty, inordinate way with all means & tricks. And they are still drawn & enticed incessantly by their own lust. Therefore Christians must continually watch, pray, & fight & they need this earnest, powerful warning: "Nicht in Schmausereien und Saufgelagen, nicht in Unzucht und Ausschweifungen, nicht in Hader und Eifersucht" ("not in rioting & drunkenness, not in chambering & wantonness, not in strife & envying"). What Paul has to say concerning the positive side of the Christian conduct, concerning the good works, he includes now in the one expression: "sondern ziehet an den Herrn Jesus mit Christus" ("but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ"). Here he shortly places all the weapons of light into one heap in this, that he admonishes us to clothe ourselves in Christ. "Christ is pattern in two ways. The one, that we clothe ourselves in His virtues, which take

place through faith, which rests on the fact that Christ has died for him & has done all things for him." "The other time He is our example & pattern, that we should follow & be like Him, to go even in the clothing of virtue, in which He goes." Luther, *Churchpostille*, II. Louis Ed., III, 13, 14. This latter manner is here meant. For the foregoing section deals not with faith, but with sanctification. The Christians have long ago put on Christ in Baptism, when they became believers. Therefore they have clothed themselves in Christ's work and merit in Christ's blood & righteousness as in a beautiful dress of state. Gal. 3, 27. From that it follows that they now put on Christ in sanctification, that they walk after the pattern & example of Christ. Christ lives in them & to be changed in their life & conduct; Christ's bright virtues, Christ's simplicity, holiness, purity, sincerity, love, modesty, goodness, humility, good temper, friendliness shine forth from their conduct. Thus attired with Christ's image they walk toward the day of Jesus Christ, the day of salvation. And the cry: "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ" never helps us to that point, to advance us in such holiness & conduct, so that we are renewed from day to day according to Christ's image & perfected from one purity to another.

The final expressions, *v. 14b*, καὶ τῷ σαρκεὶ ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, because of the customary expressions *σὰρξ*, and because *πρὸς* stands before *τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις* and not before *ἐν*, ἐν *ἐπιθυμίαις*, we understand best of all of the fact that the Apostle forbids the Christians to carry the cross for the flesh, to act weakly with the flesh, which would only lead to the excitement of evil desires. The Christians shall find themselves in the flesh, in the unbridled corrupt nature, & so evil desires can easily arise & become strong in them, which break thru the life in Christ. And so they should see to it that this does not happen, should not let the flesh, but hold the same in bounds.

444.
14/1-12.

The Apostle admonishes the Christians to put off the works of darkness & to walk honestly, since the day of the Lord is very near.

Chapter XIV.

Concerning the Relationship to One Another of the Weak in Faith & the Strong in Faith.

Y. 1-12.

The previous admonition applied to the Christians in general. There follows now an admonition which concerns the conduct of the Roman Christians to a definite class of their Christian brethren, the so-called "Haukenschwachen", as well as the conduct of the latter over against the others who do not share their peculiarities. What the circumstances of the case were with these weak-faithed ones in Rome, one sees from the individual expressions & amplifications of the foregoing chapter & therefore we can settle this historical question best of all at the close instead of at the beginning of the explanation. We still remark here only the fact that it is very conceivable that Paul was very exactly acquainted with the conditions of the Roman congregation, in that he could easily learn their friends & acquaintances in Rome as well as in general those traveling Christians, how it stood with the cause of Christ in the world capital.

Τὸν δὲ ἄβελεινόν τε καὶ πιστὸν προσχευέτω. Thus the new section begins. "Den aber, der in Bezug auf den Glauben, oder, as we rather say, "der im Glauben schwach ist, nehmet an" to "christl. brüder: liebet gemeinschaftlich" (Weiss. Lullardt). (A. V.: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye.") That this admonition is simply directed to the Roman Christians shows that the weak in faith formed a small minority. The addition, καὶ ἐξ ἑκαστοῦ ἑκάστης, shows that to which it should not come, "nicht zur Beweithlung der Gedanken" ("not to doubtful disputations"). The nearest meaning of ἐκαστοῦ, ἐκαστοῦ, "Beweithlung", (judgment), cf. Matt. 13, 3; 1 Cor. 2, 10, fits here best of all. Nowhere is the substantive ἐκαστοῦ found in the meaning "Zweifel" (doubt). ἑκάστης are thoughts which one makes of himself, mostly foolish or perverted thoughts. When the Christians do business with their weak brethren in a very brotherly manner, instead of casting them away from themselves, then it will be avoided that they apply themselves to criticism, to the criticism of the thoughts & opinions of the brothers, & thus dissensions shall be prevented. And in that the Apostle seeks above all to guard the peace in the congregation: "ὅς μιν πιστεύει, φάγῃ καὶ πίῃ, ὅς δὲ ἄβελεινός τις ἦν, ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει." (A. V.: "Der Eine hat das Vertrauen, alles zu essen, der Schwache ist (nur) Gemeine.") "for one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs". Some, the strong ones, who were in the majority, "troubled themselves" (Pueckert & Wette, Tritschke, Weiss. Winer, para. 44, 3), to eat all foods, also meat, without fearing injury from it" (Weiss), injury for their souls & their souls' salvation, with-

out fear of offending God thereby. They ate everything with a good, firm conscience. One sees from this how the $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in vii. 1. 2 and in the entire following amplification is to be taken. $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ designates here as little as in $12, 3. 6$, the $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau' \epsilon\gamma\gamma\eta\varsigma$, the faith in Christ, the fides salutaris, but designates very generally trust, confidence, & certainly here the confidence is meant which refers to the actions of the Christian, 'the moral convictions' (Meyer, Philippus), that that which one does is not displeasing to God, is not detrimental to Christianity. This confidence roots itself certainly in the fides $\kappa\alpha\tau' \epsilon\gamma\gamma\eta\varsigma$. Only a believing Christian, who knows himself to be reconciled to God through Christ, is considerate of the fact, not to grieve his God in any manner, not to endanger his life of faith. Faith in Christ & thus Christ in God brings with itself that a Christian does is intent upon doing only that of which he is convinced in his conscience that it is right before God & is salutary for himself, or at least not harmful. And of this were the strong in faith convinced, of whom Paul speaks here, with respect to the eating of meat. The weak in faith, on the other hand, in this respect had a weak conscience, severe opinions of conscience; they were doubtful whether it was entirely safe for them to eat meat; they feared that they might not be completely acceptable to God & embarrassing to their spiritual life. Thus we understand with the majority of the expositors, also the ancient, the difference between the weak & the strong. Köster, Biring.

(Baldwin, & Calvin, for example, describe the $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in our chapter as conscientia, tranquillitas conscientiae, as persecutio cordis, quod ea, quae fierent, de non sentingratis, and the weakness of faith as ambiguitas conscientiae. Luther also speaks here of a weak conscience. Rom. viii. 13 the apostle admonishes both groups. Therefore whoever eats, eats meat with full ease, should not despise, not disdain the one who does not eat, so that he does not make such outward things as eating & drinking a thing of conscience. On the other hand he who does not eat should not judge, should not cause the one who does eat to be suspected, as if he were a power Christian, as if he is not in full earnest with his Christianity. He confirms the latter admonition in vii. 3. 4 . "Denn Gott hat ihn angenommen" ("for God hath received him"), namely, even the brother who permits himself the eating of meat; the same he understands in grace with God. But it is not the proper thing "einen fremden Knecht zu richten". (A.V. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?") It is not fitting to judge a Christian brother, who still belongs to Christ, who is Christ's own. For Christ is here regarded as the lord, the master of the household, the Christians as domestic servants, really $\text{o}\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, household slaves, of Christ. "Er steht über fällt seinem eigenen Herrn" ("to his own master he stands & he falls"). $\text{Ti}\pi\iota\delta\iota\omega\kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\omega$ is dativus of reference. It is a case of the Lord, it depends on the Lord, whether his servant stands or falls. We take "standing" and "falling" here with most expositors not concerning standing steadfast & not standing steadfast in the judgment, but of the standing steadfast & not standing steadfast of perseverance & non-perseverance in good, in obedience, in a Christian conduct of life." For even the following words point to that: "er wird aber stehen bleiben", $\text{o}\kappa\alpha\tau' \epsilon\gamma\gamma\eta\varsigma$. $\text{S}\epsilon$; "Denn Gott merkt wohl", $\text{S}\upsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\tau$, ihm stehen zu machen", $\text{o}\tau\gamma\alpha\tau\iota$, or "aufrecht zu halten" ("Yea, he shall

Lord, whether his servant stands or falls. We take "standing" and "falling" here with most expositors not concerning standing steadfast & not standing steadfast in the judgment, but of the standing steadfast & not standing steadfast of perseverance & non-perseverance in good, in obedience, in a Christian conduct of life." For even the following words point to that: "er wird aber stehen bleiben", $\text{o}\kappa\alpha\tau' \epsilon\gamma\gamma\eta\varsigma$. $\text{S}\epsilon$; "Denn Gott merkt wohl", $\text{S}\upsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\tau$, ihm stehen zu machen", $\text{o}\tau\gamma\alpha\tau\iota$, or "aufrecht zu halten" ("Yea, he shall

446.
14/1/2.

be holden up: for God is able to make him stand'). God is very well able to maintain in the original essence such a brother who eats & enjoys all things, about whose Christian condition and (steadfastness) the weak are troubled.

Another difference between the strong & the weak is brought into prominence in v. 5. "Der eine sonder einen Tag ausser dem andern" (One man eateth with one day above another), "ἵς μὲν κρινεῖ ἡμέραν ἄπὸ ἡμέραν". The verb κρινεῖν is found in our chapter in different meanings, in the sense of "urtheilen" (judge), "beurtheilen" (criticize), then in the sense of "ungünstig urtheilen" (judge unfavorably), "verurtheilen" (condemn); in our passage the original meaning fits best of all, which is also suitable to the Latin *cernere*: "Einen oders etwas einzeln und sonderlich ins Auge fassen, beurtheilen, aussondern" (to separate someone or something, & to fix one's eyes upon particularly, to separate, to select). The weak in faith select one day above another not as a fast day, but as it is given in v. 6, as a day of prayer or a day of celebration, with the purpose of honoring the Lord especially on that day, to apply more time on that day than on other days to praying, giving praise & rendering thanks & other spiritual exercises; they supposed that they needed such spiritual stimulus, designated days of prayer for the growth of their spiritual life, so that it would not become weak. "ἵς δὲ κρινεῖ ἡμέραν ἡμέραν". "Der andere aber sonder jeden Tag aus" (Another or eateth with every day alike). These were the strong ones. To them every day appeared as a day of prayer & fasting, in that they prayed equally every day & considered God's Word. And now the apostle says that everyone, both he who makes a difference between the days as also he who holds all days alike, "in seinem eigenen Sinn fest überzeugt" ("let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind"), should be certain of this, that as he regards it, it is best for him. v. 5b. With full right can the apostle here leave everyone to his own mind, to his own way, because with respect to their own Christian conduct, to their relationship to the Lord Jesus Christ no difference exists between the two parties. He brings that into prominence in v. 6. "Wer auf den Tag bedacht ist" ("he that regardeth the day"), even the day which he selects above another, "ist dem Herrn bedacht" ("regardeth it unto the Lord"), would thereby serve the Lord Christ, in that he consecrates even this day to the special service of the Lord. Self-evidently the other also, who regards all days alike, but sanctifies every day by prayer & God's Word, will serve the Lord. Still the antithesis is not δὲ μὴ, ἀλλὰ οὐδὲ ὅτι ἡμέραν ἄπὸ ἡμέραν κρινεῖ οὐδὲ σπορεύει is too little certified, in that it is lacking in ὁ ABCDEFA. It is also unnecessary. For the thought that the strong & the weak in their peculiarities are still one with one another in the principle matter which concerns the relationship to Christ & God, comes out sufficiently in the following, where Paul returns to the principle difference, the eating & the non-eating. "Wer das meat, ist dem Herrn" ("He that eateth, eateth to the Lord"). Thereby, that he eats all things, eats also meat, he confirms his Christian freedom, the freedom which he has in Christ, thus he thereby honors the Lord Christ. That then ἵς δὲ κρινεῖ attaineth the honor of God sooner

forth also from the fact that he gives thanks to God for all food: εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ. The latter expression is the usual designation of the table-prayer. Matt. 23:35; 26:26; Acts 27:35; 1 Cor. 10:30; 11:24; 1 Tim. 4:4. "And we must eat, eat, dem Herrn nicht und dankt Gott!" (and he that eateth not to the Lord he eateth not: & giveth God thanks). Like the eating, so the non-eating takes place to the Lord as service & praise. The weak withhold themselves from the partaking of meat, in that they think somewhat that they are thus better prepared for prayer & the worship of God. And thereby they also give thanks to God for the food which they enjoy, the vegetables. Thus here as there the same relationship, the same position toward Christ & God. The one, like the other, is intent upon serving Christ, seeks only God's honor. With reference to Christianity, as Hofmann expresses himself, there is no difference between the weak and the strong.

That the mind of the Christian, no matter whether he regards certain days or regards all days alike, whether he eats or does not eat, is always turned to the Lord is proven in v. 7.3a by the fact that the entire life of the Christian, yes, his life & death is consecrated & dedicated to the Lord. "For whoever has consecrated himself to the Lord in common things & in all things has also consecrated himself to Him in individual things & particular things." Philippi. "Denn unser Heimer, lebt ihm selber, und Reiner

(stirbt ihm selber; denn wenn wir leben, leben wir dem Herrn, und wenn wir sterben, sterben wir dem Herrn) ("for none of us liveth to himself, & no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; & whether we die, we die unto the Lord"). Concerning the relationship of the Christian to Christ, concerning the fact that life & death depends on the Lord, stands in the Lord's hand and power, the discussion is not here, but as the connection with the foregoing shows, concerning the subject is the relationship of the Christian to Christ. "Not in our own service & for our own honor, but in the service to the honor of the Lord does our life pass, even as our death." Philippi. With every thing that we do in the life of the body, with all our actions we serve the Lord & honor Him also with our death. Death is certainly final of all an event, but it can also be regarded as our action & conduct, in that we Christians die willingly, willingly follow the call of the Lord, when He summons us out of this life, & joyfully & trustingly commend our souls into the hands of the Lord. But when it now reads further in v. 7.8.1: εἴτε ὄντι ζήμεν, εἴτε ἔκτανθ' ἡμεῖς καμῶν, τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσμ' ἐν, "Wann wir leben, wenn wir sterben, sind wir des Herrn" ("whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's") - then certainly with the τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσμ' ἐν, as Hofmann correctly calls attention to the fact, only the objective belonging to the Lord can be designated. Our subjective relationship to the

Lord has the objective relationship in which we stand to the Lord as its hypothesis. The first is a result & effect of the latter, the latter can thus be observed & concluded out of the former. Thus the following εἴτε is meant in our passage. We are the Lord's own, as long as we live, & remain the Lord's possession, even when we die, past death into all eternity. Our relationship to Christ is not dissolved by death, it is not altered in the least. No one nor any thing can tear us out of His hand. "There is nothing that can separate

447.
14.1-12.

me from Jesus, nothing, be it life or death. By this subjective & objective belonging of His to the Lord every believing Christian gives testimony, when he prays: "Lord Jesus, to Thee I live, Lord Jesus, to Thee I die; Lord Jesus, I am Thine dead & alive." That we are the Lord's own in life & death is guaranteed by the death & resurrection of the Lord. Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἦτορὸς ἦν ὁ Θάνατος καὶ ἡ Ἑγέρσις, ἵνα καὶ νεκροὺν καὶ ζώντων. ~~καὶ~~ κυρίως γ. "Denn dazu ist Christ gestorben und wieder lebendig geworden, dass er sowohl über Tote als über Lebendige Herr sei." ("For to this end Christ both died, & rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead & living"). V. 9. The simple ^{καὶ} ἡ Ἑγέρσις after ἦν ὁ Θάνατος is the most attested reading. The placing of καὶ νεκροὺν before has only a formal basis, in the formal parallel between ὁ Θάνατος καὶ ἡ Ἑγέρσις and καὶ νεκροὺν καὶ ζώντων. With His death & His resurrection Christ has aimed at the point, & this purpose has now been realized, that He would be our Lord in life & death, and that we should be His own. By His death Christ has redeemed us & thereby gained us on as for Himself. By His death He has won the right of lordship over us. And after He has risen from the dead, He has actually made us His own through word & spirit, has drawn us to Himself, has converted us to Himself, so that we now belong to Him who has arisen from the dead. 74. And He is & remains our Lord, & we are His own, even when we are dead, so long as He lives & He lives & reigns to all eternity. But out of all that it presents itself how improper it would be, if Christians would separate themselves because of the difference in eating & non-eating. The contrast between life & death, which far surpasses the contrast concerning eating & non-eating, the great contrast between life & death is completely indifferent for our conduct to Christ & for our relationship to Christ. We serve the Lord & are the Lord's own, whether we live or die. Much less can the simple contrast between eating & non-eating, come into consideration for our conduct & relationship to Christ. And so it should be an easy thing for the Christians to disregard such trivial differences.

And therefore the Apostle returns to the former warning: "Der aber, was richtet die deinen Brüder?" namely, the stronger, "oder du, was verurtheilst die deinen Brüder?" namely, the weaker. ("But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother?") V. 10a. This warning he strengthens still with the pointing to the future judgment. Τίς γὰρ πᾶσι κρίσει τῷ Θεῷ; "Denn wir müssen alle hingutreten zu dem Richtertuhl Gottes" ("For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ"). V. 10b. The reading τῷ Θεῷ is attested by the most & the most important codices, like A B C D E F G. The judgment seat of God is identical with the judgment seat of Christ in 11 Cor. 5:10. For "God shall judge the world even thus Christ." The Father has given all judgment to the Son. John 5:22. That we shall all be placed before God's judgment, God has already attested by the Prophet Isaiah, 45:23 in that He swore by Himself, "dass jeder seine sich mir beugen und jede Junge soll bekennen" ("every knee shall bow to me, & every tongue shall confess to God"), namely, that God alone is Lord and Judge. V. 11. Πᾶσι γὰς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς κρίσιν ἑστήκει τῷ Θεῷ is a free translation of the Hebrew יְיָ יִשְׁפֹּט - 73. "jede Junge wird schwören", namely, swear to me. At that time every one shall do homage

to the Lord Jehovah, our Lord & Judge & shall swear to Him. The Prophet Isaiah here had in mind all the Gentiles, who would be converted to the Lord, vv. 22-24 & 25; so Paul then also in the entire context speaks only of the Christians. And that also Isaiah in the added quotation points to the final judgment, is proven by the expression in v. 24b: "Und es werden zu Schanden werden alle, die wider ihn eckbraunt sind" ("and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed"). Out of that which has been said it follows: "Es wird also ein jeder von uns, für sich selbst Gott Rechenschaft geben!" "so then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." v. 12. Out of the $\pi\chi\upsilon\tau\epsilon$; $\pi\chi\upsilon$, $\pi\chi\epsilon\alpha$, in vv. 10, 11 there presents itself the $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\omega\upsilon\varsigma$ in v. 12, which has the emphasis: "The day of judgment as such is also a day of accounting, & even every Christian must there give an account of himself to God. Now far God the Judge will also ask regarding the works of the Christian, namely, insofar as they are evidences of fruits of faith, has been shown above, under 2, 6 & 16. And whoever now always holds the day of accounting before his eyes, on which he has to stand & answer God for all his actions, will soon overcome the inclination to enter into judgment with his brethren, especially about such outward things as eating & non-eating.

VK. 13-23.

The Epistle comprehends the previous admonition, which referred to both groups, in the one short expression: Μηκετι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν, "Insect ^{num} nicht einander richten" ("I see not therefore judge one another any more"). v. 12 like the dead aim / contempt, of which the stronger easily made themselves guilty over against the weaker, including in itself a disapproving judgment over the latter. The recapitulation in v. 13a serves only as a transition to the warning in v. 13b: ἄλλ' ἡ τούτο κρίνεις μελλόν, τὸ μὴ τιθεῖναι πρόσκειμα τῷ ἑσθλῷ 3) σκῆνδελον; "condemns scilicet, that means "witheth", "viel mehr", which is your maxim, "daas ichs dem Bruder nicht einen Anstoß gebt," over which he comes to a fall, "oder ein Ärgernis", "whereby he is enticed to sin." ("But judge this rather that no man get a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way") This warning, which extends through the entire second half of the chapter, is directed to the strong while in the first half the weak had been admonished in particular. Between the two expressions πρόσκειμα and σκῆνδελον, which are both used here in the metaphorical, moral sense, there is no essential difference. "The double designation is an urgent exhaustion of the concept; τιθεῖναι, however, refers to the original real sense of both words." Weiss. Now far the stronger ones could easily give an occasion to fall to the weak is explained by the following double statement in v. 14. Οἷς καὶ πέπειμαί, ἐν Κυρίῳ ἴησού, ὅτι οὐδὲν κοῖνον ἵς ἑτοῦ. Ἡτοῦ, οὐδὲν, οὐδὲν in the N. T. book also stand in the stead of the reflexive pronoun. "Ich weiss und bin überzeugt, indem Herrn Jesu," that is, the Christian, divine certainty, which is rooted in the con-

450.
14/13-23.

munion with Christ, "dass nicht", no food, likewise not the flesh of animals, "durch sich selbst" or "an sich selbst", "gemein ist" ("I know, I am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing (unclean of itself)", profane & defiled for the Christians, that the enjoyment of any food, likewise the enjoyment of meat, is compatible with the Christian character which the Christians possess, that a Christian does not defile himself or sin, when he takes any food to himself. Still there now follows a restriction: $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\ \tau\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\ \gamma\iota\ \sigma\omega\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu\ \epsilon\iota\chi\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$; "ausser der defiliert hält, dass es gemein sei, dem ist es gemein" ("but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean"). The $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$ is not like $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}$, but *quia*, which, without considering $\sigma\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, points only to $\alpha\upsilon\ \sigma\iota\ \nu\ \kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$. Certainly whoever thinks that any food is unclean & defiles him, whoever thinks that he sins when he eats meat also sins when he does that. Not that the eating defiles him, but because he violates his conviction concerning food, his conscience. And even his brother misleads him into this, when the same inconsiderately asserts his contrary conviction, eats meat before him brazenly & boldly, & thus through his example entices him to do likewise. The question is raised, whether the statement in v. 15 joins itself to the expressions in v. 14 by means of $\sigma\iota$ or by means of $\gamma\iota\ \rho$, whether Paul continues: $\epsilon\iota\ \gamma\iota\ \rho$ or $\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\iota$ $\sigma\iota\ \delta\ \beta\epsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\ \delta\ \epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \delta\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$, $\omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\gamma\chi\iota\ \pi\eta\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. "Wenn wenn" or "wenn aber um die Speise willen dein Bruder ge-schädigt wird, so wende dich nicht mehr nach die Speise" ("But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably"). This sentence evidently no longer serves for the explanation of the offense, but states that the one who offends his brother thereby violates love, & thus it brings in a new thought. And so the imitator of the "Se" is in place here, while one cannot begin with the $\gamma\iota\ \rho$. $\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ does not fit here in the meaning of "beuhen" (grieve, offend), but only in the other meaning which it often has in classical Greek, "verletzen" (violate), "schädigen" (harm, injure). For there is not established here that the weak brother is grieved by the example of the stronger, by his eating, which could only have the result that he would guard himself against it but the other case would much rather be present here, that the weaker brother would permit himself to be overruled & misled by the stronger to also eat on his part, & thereby injure & violate his conscience. But then even the stronger brother with his eating had given occasion to such injury of the conscience, he is responsible for it, & it applies to him that he no longer walks in love. Yet with his inconsiderate eating, he can well bring it about that the weak brother is lost. For whoever acts contrary to his conscience in one matter & accustoms himself in brotherlessness of conscience can finally lose the good conscience and faith completely & forever. And so the earnest admonition comes to the stronger brother: "Verdiene durch deine Speise den nicht, für welchen Christus gestorben ist" ("Do not bring not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died"). Christ has permitted it to cost him his life to save your brother from condemnation, & you would not even let it cost you your eating to protect your brother against condemnation? Bengel: Ne

gloria perierit tunc cibum, quam Christiani vitam suam.

(The Christians should guard themselves against offense, not to offend their weak brethren, and now also well take care that they give no offense to those on the outside. 14, 31 x 6, by which we see that Paul is to 2 y x 6 v. "So werde euer gut nicht verlästert" ("Let not then your good be evil spoken of"). 14, 13. He speaks now again with 5 v. v. turns to the Christians in general, also to the weak in faith. He now takes in view the relationship of the Christians to the unbelievers. He speaks concerning the good or the treasure of the Christians, which is the possession of salvation of the Christians (Ruechert, Hofmann, Weiss), or, as we can say with this ancient expositors, the Gospel of Christ, by which the salvation is mediated to us. And now he admonishes the Christians not to give the unbelievers any occasion to blaspheme this good of theirs. To this the Christians give occasion, when they wrangle with one another over eating & drinking. That brings the non-Christians to the thought, as if in the Christian religion, according to the teaching of the Gospel, it comes to such outward things, as if according to the thought of the Christians that salvation depends on the fact whether one eats or drinks or does the opposite, & thus invites their mockery. Paul shows the reason for his admonition, in that in 14, 17 he recalls the essential phases of Christianity. "Hemmer Reich, Gottes ist nicht Essen und Trinken, sondern Gerechtigkeit und Friede und Freude in dem Heiligen Geist" ("For the Kingdom of God is not meat & drink; but righteousness & peace, & joy in the Holy Ghost"). In the Kingdom of God, in which the Christians belong, which is made up of Christians, it does not deal with eating & drinking, but with these great things, these principle points: righteousness, peace & joy in the Holy Ghost. Many expositors find in the three expressions a description of the Christian conduct, of the ethical condition of the Christians as the members of the Kingdom of God. But 14, 17 is never taken by Paul as a Christian virtue, & so also the righteous essence of the Christians cannot be meant with 14, 18 v. 7; and the peaceful disposition over against the neighbor cannot be meant with 14, 19 v. 7. With the other expositors like Koenig and Lohmeyer with Ruechert, Tholuck, Philippson, Weiss, Luthardt we understand under 14, 18 v. 7, the righteousness 14, 17 v. 7, the righteousness which awaits before God, the righteousness of faith under 14, 19 v. 7 the peace with God, & under 14, 17 v. 7, 14, 18 v. 7, the joy, which animates the Christians, which the Holy Spirit, who dwells in them, works in them. These are the essential possessions of the Kingdom of God. And now when at ready further in 14, 18: "Benn wer darin Christe dient, der ist Gott gelüg und den Menschen werth" ("for he that in these things serves Christ is acceptable to God, & approved of men"), then it is certainly not meant by that, that a Christian serves Christ in & with the three factors mentioned. For even previously Christian virtues have

not been mentioned, but the great possessions & blessings of Christianity. That a Christian serves Christ is much rather an effect & result of his righteousness, the peace, the joy in the Holy Ghost. Whoever has been justified before God, then Christ, who ever has appeared with God, then Christ, who ever has appeared from the heart, in the Holy Ghost enables salvation in Christ, then also serves the Lord Christ with all the powers of the body & soul. For this reason we have fitly left of all the reading: & 14, 18 v. 7, 14, 19 v. 7, which also has more

guard your brother against injury & corruption. In the context therefore it deals not with the fact that the strong in faith act correctly for his own person, but that he does not do evil but good to the weak brother. The two verbs ἡ ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶν ἡ ἀσθενὴς behind ἡ ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶν ἡ ἀσθενὴς are not sufficiently attested & are also very unnecessary. We also learn here that the weak in faith makes nothing of conscience out of the drinking of wine. The apostle gives the strong in faith something further to consider: "But hast den, 'blauen' ('Hast thou faith?'), the certain confidence, that you are right therein, when you eat flesh or drink wine. 'Habe ich gegen dich selbst vor Gott' ('have it to thyself before God'), I do not carry it before your brethren as a display. ἡ ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶν ἡ ἀσθενὴς ἐστὶν ἡ ἀσθενὴς. 'Selbst erden, welcher sich selbst nicht richtet,' does not judge, gives himself no blame, 'indem, was er billigt,' 'approves, accepts the act, agendum eligit. ('Happy is he that condemns not himself in that thing which he alloweth.'). Luther very fittingly: 'indem, was er annimmt.' 'The strong in faith accepts all foods & drinks & enjoys them, also meat & wine, and he is to be called happy, & should let himself be satisfied that in this respect he feels himself free & not bound in his conscience, but not to force his freedom on the weak brother. This expression includes in itself that for the stronger & freer one in the case, that the consideration falls upon the weaker, there is no danger of offense present, that he may by all

(means use his freedom. For Paul expresses himself even so, that the one actually accepts, ἡ ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶν, the foods & drinks which the other rejects, & we have him happiness, so that he does not need to give himself any reproach in the matter. What sad result it has on the other hand, when the strong instead the weak brother to eating & drinking by an arbitrary & pitiless use of his freedom, the final statement, v. 23, still makes very clear & significant. ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ ἀσθενὴς ἐστὶν ἡ ἀσθενὴς. 'Wer aber zweifelt, wenn er isst, der ist verurteilt' ('And he that doubteth is damned if he eat'). Now the weak in faith is presented as a doubter, a waverer. Previously the apostle had said that, that the weak in faith regarded the eating of flesh as common & that he could eat flesh only with injury to his conscience. Now he does not speak of an evil, but of a doubting, wavering conscience. When the weak brother sees the strong eat meat, resp. drink wine, in an unembarrassed manner, then that can have for him a twofold effect, either this, that he does this after him immediately & certainly, with an evil conscience, or the other, that he falls into vacillation, wavers back & forth, whether he also can & should do it, & before he makes up his mind about the matter, therefore eat & drink with a doubting conscience. And now the apostle attests that he also in the latter case sins & with the deed condemns himself. 'Denn er thaten nicht aus dem blauen, litten aber, was nicht aus dem blauen geht, das ist, litten.' ('Because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin'). He does not do it with the certainty of doing right thereby. But what anyone does without being certain that he does right therein, with the fear that it might possibly be incorrect, is sin.

After we have realized the amplification of the apostle in his entire course, we can now also connect

some idea of the characteristic peculiarity of the Christians in Rome who were weak in faith. The great majority of commentators regard the same as Jewish Christians. The old expositors remark simply that these Christians out of Israel had still clung to the Mosaic rituals. Many of them & thus, for example, Gritze point as a parallel to Lev. 2, 16: "Let us not therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." In no case were the weak in Rome, if they were in particular Jewish Christians, Pharisee-minded Judaists, like the errorists in Galatia & those misled by them, who thought that together with faith in Christ circumcision & Law were necessary for salvation. For then Paul would not have judged so leniently concerning them, but much rather, similar to the Galatians, would have criticized them earnestly, even the fact that they had denied and done injury to the chief article of the Christian religion, namely, justification by faith. The mild treatment which the Epistle would grant to the weak Christians in Rome, on the other hand, is to the point, where these as Israelites still kept the customs & traditions of the fathers in their outward manner of life & for their part lived like Jews & not like Gentiles, without forcing the Gentiles to do these things. In any case they stood correct in the doctrine. The difference between weak & strong, as it comes to our attention in our chapter, lies simply in the sphere of life. But the manner of life, of the weak in faith was, when one inspects it more closely, still not the Jewish way of life. Nowhere in the Law were the Jews forbidden to eat meat or to drink wine, but only forbidden to partake of the flesh of unclean animals. And that these Roman Christians according to their own will selected one day above another was also something different from observation of Jewish festival days. The Israelite festival calendar was for the Jews a known quantity. In no syllable in our chapter does the Epistle consider the sabbath or the new moon. Moreover the expressions $\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma$ & $\pi\alpha\rho\iota$ $\pi\alpha\rho\iota$ $\pi\alpha\rho\iota$ $\pi\alpha\rho\iota$ also does not fit the Christian celebration of Sunday, which at that time already had established itself in Rome. That it does not deal with the designations of the ceremonial law here is almost generally conceded. And so most of the modern exegesis, for example, Meyer, Weiss, Hodge, Luthardt, & others characterize the originality of the weak in faith as over-legalistic scrupulousness. But all exaggeration of the Law still has some support in the Law. How should scrupulous Jewish Christians come to the point from their legalistic standpoint to regard as unclean that food & drink which the Law expressly declares as clean, or to choose days, while according to the basic Jewish Law all festivals rest upon divine institutions? One has therein recalled the fact that similar phenomena are found in later Judaism. According to IV Esdras 9, 24, 25, 12, 51, abstinence from meat & wine served as a preparation for reception of revelations. The Babylonians forbade the eating of flesh & the drinking of wine for those who had a corpse in the house or who had to care for the burial of a corpse. Some rabbis prohibited the use of meat slaughtered by Gentiles & of wine prepared by Gentiles. Nevertheless these were exceptional cases which presumed the eating of meat & drinking of wine as a rule. In the voluminous codes of the

traditions of the elders, there are found, just as in the Law, some ordinances concerning abstinence from meat & wine. The overzealous Pharisees at the time of Christ & of the Apostles, who fasted twice a week, were generally accustomed to eat flesh & drink wine without any consideration. And they certainly would not have permitted it, if anyone would have enriched the lawful sabbath & festival cycle with self-selected fast days. From what we know about the super-legalistic course of later Judaism, the thoughts & conscience of those Roman Christians do not explain themselves. Meyer & others regard them as Essenes. The Jewish sect of the Essenes exercised themselves freely in asceticism. Still that the Essenes had abstained completely from meat & drink, cannot be proven, as Hens has confirmed. That applies to the Ebionites, to whom Bauer here appeals, who, however, must fundamentally remain out of consideration here, because they date first from the destruction of Jerusalem. There comes that to which Lile appeals: "Ebionite and Ebionite abstinence was not a harsher, unessential part, but a fruit of a turn of the mind which was diametrically opposed to the Pauline, which the Apostles had never taken into protection or even defended." After the example of Augustine, Ruckert, Tholuck & Philippi see the basis of the weakness of the weak in faith in their anxiety "sich durch den nicht leicht zu vermeidenden Genuss des auf den heidnischen Fleischmärkten häufiglichen Opferfleisches und des Libationsweines zu unreinigen und in entheiligende Gemeinschaft mit den Götzern zu treten." They take 1 Cor. 8 as a parallel. Nevertheless, the peristoma saligne, the meat of the sacrifice, the wine of the libation is not mentioned with a single word in Rom. 14. There Paul speaks only of the fact that the weak in general might eat no meat & drink no wine. Moreover, it cannot be proven that the Corinthian Christians, who took offense at the eating of the meat of the sacrifice, were Jewish Christians. Therefore the identification of the weak in faith in Rome with the Jewish Christians, resp. the deduction of the thoughts & conscience of the weak from Jewish ideas & principles, has no support & foundation in the explanation of the Apostle. Likewise the expressions κοινὸν and καὶ ὅτι do not necessarily lead to this interpretation. If these also are taken from the terminology of the Law, which was also well known to the Gentile Christians, then they still declare nothing else than that one sins against himself through the enjoyment of the food & drink concerned.

Another hypothesis, which is advocated by Eichhorn & recently by Spitta, traces the peculiarity of the weak in faith back to the heathen philosophical influence, especially the neopythagorians. Against this Heine remarks correctly: "The general avoidance of flesh & wine in this time is not demonstrable in the pythagorean school. Yet the strict carrying out of this asceticism is not required, even when neopythagoreanism was again strengthened." And as Paul, who, when he encountered non-Christian speculations, in his congregations, rose up so much more sharply (Col., 2. 8. 18.), supposed to have judged so mildly in Rome, over so similar appearances? Even the indulgent treatment of the weak shows that their asceticism had its root not in observations which stood in contradiction with the Christian religion.

Finally there are also oppositors, who here look away from all historical causes, how then also, some such

can be proven, for example, Hofmann, Kodel, & Schott. The first ones ascribe to the weak motives which also cannot be proven. Hofmann writes: "But well-considered thought arises, whether it agreed with (the holiness of) the congregation of God to enjoy such things to which man was not referred in the beginning, & which the Christians would better do without than for the sake of well-living." And Kodel: "According to the account of Genesis the eating of animals was not originally given to man (Gen. 1.29). Only after the Deluge was this expressly declared as permitted (1.3). Also the discovery of the wine-growing datea (?) from this latter-named period & the misuse of this drink joined directly to its discovery. Such biblical examples could conceivably bring earnest readers of the B. T. to think, & could call forth from them that abstinence of which our text speaks. In such a way of acting no Christian principle really came into question. Furthermore, it was not as an attempt to return to the Law, but to the original manner of life, which easily appeared to be the most normal. And so it is very explicable that the Apostle does not enter into the real kernel of the question, but only holds to that side which concerns the good understanding among the members of the congregation." Such reflections, which might have moved the weak to withhold themselves from the enjoyment of meat & wine, are not mentioned in our text with a single syllable. In this case the Apostle could still not leave the real kernel of the question entirely untouched. Moreover it is also very questionable whether the making of wine & the enjoyment of wine dates from the time of Noah. Schott judges: "Only thus, as an act of Christian freedom (Ev. 7.25.15) in the interest of world-denying sanctification, is this abstinent eating & holding of days meant; even because it is that, therefore the Apostle can summon himself to that: Εἰς τὸ εἶναι ὡς οἱ ἄγγελοι." This judgment comes nearest to the true facts of the case.

The same is much simpler than one generally supposes. One does not need to draw the peculiarity of these Roman Christians so far. The biblical text gives sufficient information on the matter. The 7.25.15 shows that the tendency of the weak in faith simply moved toward the point to serve the Lord with the whole soul. Therefore they chose one day above another, because they wanted to consecrate one entire day to the Lord & to intercourse with the Lord, in order to remain very close to Him. To the same purpose served also the abstinence from meat & wine. They wanted to be very moderate & sober at all times for prayer. Therefore they avoided such strong food & drink, which lie very heavily on the body & spirit & are more exposed to misuse than other foods & drinks. Their thoughts of conscience were occasioned by the form & nature of the things which are treated here. Every noble & conscientious man is cautious & prudent in the use of meat & wine, because he knows that they can easily lead to gluttony & drunkenness, & a Christian is doubly prudent herein, because he knows that excess in use makes him unsuitable for spiritual, divine things. Therefore a scrupulous Christian could well come to the thought that it is the best & most salutary & also the most pleasing to God, when they refrain entirely from meat & wine. The weak in Rome were, as one has correctly named

them, ascetics. Still with their asceticism they did not strive for any monastic holiness, any spirituality of the angels; they were no proud, strong spirits, but distressed souls, who therefore feared that, if they regarded all days alike & granted themselves strong food & drink, they might draw farther away from the Lord, whom they loved from the heart, & thereby grieve Him. That was certainly a weakness in faith, in conscience. But since they meant it uprightly with the Lord, & since they did not consider their way as directly commanded by God, still less sought to force them upon others as God's commandments, of which there is not found a trace in our chapter. Therefore the Apostle excuses their weakness. Now the less the danger lay near them above all, that they might cause others, who here had a freer & stronger conscience, to be suspected, as if they were not so zealous in the service of the Lord. Therefore Paul earnestly warns them against that, not to judge their brethren. Examples of similar asceticism & abstinence, in the interest of temperance or of the denial of the world & holiness are found at all times. It is a similar phenomenon, when in this day distressed Christians deny themselves the enjoyment of spiritual drinks or otherwise permitted joys & pleasures, so that they might not thereby injure their spiritual life. The present day temperance and Sabbath fanatics, certainly, who assert their way as a general demand & as a *mandatum divinum* and exercise their propaganda with force, do not belong to this class of the weak in faith. With them the Apostle

would speak in an entirely different tone than with the abstainers & holders of days in Rome. Whether the latter moreover were Jewish Christians or Gentile Christians is not evident from the text & without any consequence for the foregoing questions. The most evident thing is, that this minority, of the Roman congregation, into which these thoughts of conscience had settled themselves, sprang out of Jewish and Gentile Christians, since their motions had neither a specifically Jewish nor a specifically ~~Gentile~~ character.

The reminder & admonition, which the Apostle would impart in our chapter, not only to the weak in faith in Rome, but also to the stronger & freer ones, contains, as ancient & modern exegesis notes, an instruction concerning the so-called *adiaphora* and gives the correct directive *de usum rerum medium* (Korner). The difference between the weak & the strong concerns the middle things, that is, things which are neither commanded nor forbidden in the Word of God, which are placed in the liberty of the Christian. Eating of meat and drinking of wine is not forbidden in the Law, was also not forbidden to the Jews in the ceremonial law, certainly also not commanded. To choose one day above another, which as has been shown before, has nothing to do with the Old Testament celebration of the Sabbath, is not commanded in the Law, certainly also not forbidden.

And what Paul now teaches & explains concerning the use of meat & wine & the choice of days applies to the intermediate things in general. Therefore first of all a misunderstanding is to be excluded. The *res mediae*, or, as one has also called them, the *res indifferentes*, lie, so to speak, in a neutral sphere. But it does not follow from that that a Christian, when he concerns himself with these things, stands out of his Christianity & takes a neutral stand. A Christian serves the Lord via the Lord, also when he eats or drinks or rests. What

458.
14/13-23.

he also does or permits, that he does or permits to the Lord; he lives to the Lord & due to the Lord. Sanctification embraces the entire life of a Christian. Nevertheless, however, in adiaphora the action is placed into the keeping of the choice & freedom of the Christian. Here every Christian can have his own thoughts & can act according to his own mind. He has the right to use these things; but it is also not forbidden him to avoid them, if he regards them as good & salutary. Everyone should be firmly convinced in his own mind, be certain of this, that in the way which he has chosen he can best serve the Lord. The axiom "ERESISTO; EV TΩ IΣΩ VOI" ΠΥΠΟΦΟΡΙΣ is certainly applied only in this sphere of adiaphora, not in the province of the truths of revelation, not there where the actions of the Christians are previously ruled by the Word of God. It would be a horrible abuse of the Word of God, if one would cry out to a manifest transgressor of the Law or to a false believer: "Ein jeglicher sei in seiner Meinung gewiss" ("Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind"). V. 5. Brengre marker: Non loquatur (apostolus) de peccatis manifestis verbo Dei prohibitis, ut inquis designat furum et cunaret, ac bona opinione furatum esse. Hanc est protestatio contrarius facti, sed loquitur de rebus mediis seu indifferentibus. Dissimilarity in intermediate things does not affect the conduct & relationship of the Christians to the Lord, & also does not harm the brotherly reception. Uniformity in intermediate things is not necessary for the unity of the Church. For the Apostle every thing was of importance to maintain the Roman congregation. Therefore he admonishes both groups to receive one another as brethren in spite of their present differences, & earnestly warns them against despising or suspecting or carrying on one another. And this warning & admonition applies to all Christians, when different meanings & different practices in adiaphora make themselves manifest among them. There a brother leaves the other at rest in his mind. It does not injure the peace when otherwise the Christians are one in faith & in obedience over against God's Word & live in peace & love among one another & have intercourse with one another. The criticism, to which the Christians are justified, yes, are obligated, reaches just as far as God's Word reaches. When a Christian teacher teaches otherwise, when a Christian brother lives otherwise than God's Word teaches, then certainly the Christians should punish & judge the same with God's Word. It would be false patience & love of peace, if one would permit manifest opposition to the Word of God. But if we have no clear, firm word of God under our feet, which we can hold up to our brother, then we should not dispute with him over the fact that ~~that~~ he thinks or acts in this or that matter otherwise than we do. Here it applies: "En steht ob der Hölle seinem Herrn" ("To his own master he stands or falls"). V. 4. It is not excluded that one instruct a Christian brother, who makes a conscience for himself out of an intermediate thing & burdens himself with unnecessary scruples, & seek to deliver him from his fear & anxiety, as the Apostle then tried to do with him in Rome that no Jew was common. But do not let one cross the weak brother & finally let him alone when he persists in his action. The Apostle does not impose upon the weak in Rome the "apokritische" demand that they must completely give up their con-

ception, but much rather presumption in his entire amplification that the difference between the weak and the strong, the dissimilarity in the intermediate things concerned would really also continue to exist, perhaps in infinitum. In short, let one permit intermediate things to remain intermediate things, res indifferentes. There is, however, one point at which, as one is accustomed to say, intermediate things ~~cease~~ to be intermediate things. That is, circumstances can enter in, under which the use of an intermediate thing becomes sin. That the Apostle also emphasizes in our chapter. When a scrupulous Christian thinks that a certain thing, which is in itself an intermediate thing, is not directly forbidden to him by God, but is still not entirely safe, for him, is not beneficial but a hindrance to his soul & the well-being of his soul, to his intercourse with the Lord, & then nevertheless makes use of this thing with a resisting or doubting conscience, then he has sinned, in that he has violated his conscience. On the other hand, when another Christian, who has a stronger & freer conscience, arbitrarily uses this Christian freedom & freely & openly ~~also~~ does something which is in itself not wrong, but on which he knows that his weaker brother stumbles & takes offense, then he sins, in that he violates love. Changed around, it is only done right & well, when we stand on our Christian freedom over against strong & proud spirits, who would lay on our conscience an intermediate thing, their own inclination which really does not belong to the weak, & do just that which they would forbid us. When a Christian congregation correctly recognizes, considers & follows the apostolic norm laid down in Rom. 14 concerning the intermediate things & their use, then it shall be well with them, then their love & peace will remain, so that it will stand correctly with them in the principle matter. It hardly still needs the remark that the Christians, however, also have to prove & watch whether the intermediate things, which are current as such, are really intermediate things, & must guard them selves, so that they do not place beside the eating of meat & the drinking of wine & similar things openly sinful, fleshly pleasures, enjoyments, amusements, & other practices on the free list.

The Summary of the Chapter. The Apostle admonishes the weak believers not to judge the others, the strong believers not to despise the weak nor to give them offense, & both parties to strive for that which belongs to peace & to mutual edification.

Chapter XL.

Some older expositors, like Semler, Paulus, Griesbach, Eichhorn, attach without any conclusive basis the fact that the two chapters 15 and 16, which they grant as Pauline, have originally formed one Letter with chap. 14-15; others, as, for example, Baur, after the example of Marcion, doing the same in general to the Epistle Paul. Origen judges concerning Marcion: *scilicet hoc (16, 25-27) Marcion, a quo scripturas evangelicas et apostolicas interpolatas sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc,*

460.
15, 1-6.

sed et ab eo, ab inscriptione est (14, 23): omne autem quod non ex fide est, peccatum est, usque ad finem totius epistolae cuncta deservit. Also other church fathers give Marcion the reproach that he had falsified & mutilated the apostolic writings. Why he has cut off the last two chapters of the Letter to the Romans, we do not know; evidently on similar grounds as Baur. The latter ascribes these chapters to a later Paulist, who here, especially in the first half of the 15. chapter, had made concessions to the Jewish Christians, which Paul, the anti-Judaist would never have made to them, in order to reconcile the Paulinists with the Petrinists. The long series of greetings in the 16. chapter might serve the same purpose, which should give the proof that Paul had stood in close connection with the notables in the old Roman congregation. This interpretation holds together with the tendency of Baur's concerning original Christianity, which today no longer needs a reputation. The two chapters 15. and 16. are found, & certainly as the closing part of the Letter of Paul to the Romans, in all manuscripts & are confirmed by the consenting historical tradition. Their authenticity presents itself already from the inner connection in which Rom. 14 and Rom. 15 stand with one another. And so at the time all contradiction is silenced.

V. 1-13. Admonition to Patience and Concord.

V. 1-6.

In that the Apostle continues in 15, 1: Ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ὡς ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τῶν ἰσχυρῶν καὶ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς τῶν ἰσχυρῶν, he evidently adds on to the foregoing admonition; still the concepts "weak" & "strong" now enlarge themselves, to which Hofmann & Grotz particularly among the modern ones have pointed. In the foregoing section, 15, 1-13, the discussion is no more concerning the weak in faith, but concerning weak, ὁ ἰσχυρὸς, in general, & these are contrasted in genere to the strong, ὁ ἰσχυρὸς. The strong, really the capable ones, the powerful ones, are those Christians who enjoy a sound, powerful Christianity without being perfect on that account; the weak, on the other hand, really those who are incapable, those who are not powerful, are such Christians, who still suffer from special, habitually, moral infirmities. Luther's remarks very correctly: "That there among the Christians at all times both kinds of infirmities are found, inwardly in faith & conscience, outwardly in works & good conduct." The latter, which Paul treats in the 15. chapter he describes in the following manner: "These weak, however, are those who now and then stumble in manifestation, whom one, in German, calls wanderlich, Kopf- or Seltsame, who easily become angry, or otherwise have infirmities in themselves, on account of which it is difficult for them to associate with others; so that presents itself particularly between husband & wife, between master & servant, between magistrate & subject." St. Louis S. d., II, 25 ff. It is also here possible to raise a question one might find the strong with the "gentle" Christians & the weak with the "strong" Christians. But, who was an irritant, ranks himself with the strong. And now it is the duty & obligation of the

strong to bear, Bxvi & Sciv, the infirmities of the weak, which means, to take upon oneself in order to cure them. Hofmann: Bxvi & Sciv is something entirely different from to exercise indulgence, patience, consideration, & does not allow itself to be confounded with Epv. Whoever adopts the one in whom the Christian life of the fellow-Christian shows itself weak or infirm, as a burden which he takes upon himself, gives himself into a joint suffering for the purpose of assistance, instead of leaving him to himself. Then, however, this conduct, as the conclusion of the one one against whom it is exercised, differs very essentially from that of which the discussion had been in chap. 14. Luther: "Therefore this Epistle admonishes us, that we not only bear patiently our neighbor's spiritual infirmities, but should also take them up, to heal & disperse them." "Therefore let us learn here in this Epistle that a Christian walking in love consists not in this, that they find devout, just, holy men; but that they make devout, just, holy men, & let that be their work & employment on earth, that they make such people, be it with criticism, pleading, patience and with what they can. Likewise a Christian man does not live therefore, that he might find rich, strong, sound men, but that he might make such people out of the poor, weak, & infirm ones."

Yes, we ought not to please ourselves, but everyone ought to please his neighbor for good to edification. V. 16, 2. Apv & Kxiv here means "zu Gefallen sein", "zu Gefallen leben". The Epistle hereby

warns the Christians not against common self-complacency, selfishness, self-love, but, as it shows itself, from the context, against being considerate simply of the demands of one's own spiritual life. We should not let ourselves be satisfied in our own spiritual well-being, but also be helpful to our neighbor for good, for improvement & edification. Hofmann: "A Christian man would be considerate only of the fact of making his own inner life always richer & fuller, would think that he was hindering himself in this self-edification of his, if he caused himself to act with the weakness of a still infirm fellow-Christian. But says the Epistle, Christ did not act that way, but in conformity with the word of Scripture: οὐδὲν ἑαυτοῦ τὸν ὅτι ἑαυτοῦ ὅτι ἑαυτοῦ ὅτι ἑαυτοῦ. Christ also did not have pleasure in himself, did not live for His own pleasure, v. 3, was not satisfied in His own holiness, had not borne His divine glory & majesty for show, while He walked on earth, but was considerate of the best, the salvation & deliverance of the poor sinful children of men & did not permit Himself to be misled in this by the abuses of the adversaries of God, which were already prophesied by the Psalmist (Ps. 69, 10). "Altho He was really holy & full of grace, He still did not despise us, did not consider Himself good, like the Pharisee, that He had something that we did not have" etc. Luther this

example we should follow. "Nur Christus, anstatt sich an seinen eigenen Heiligkeit genügen zu lassen, der sich in einer Weise angesehen, die ihm Schmach von den Menschen brachte, welche sich schämten, dass die Christen nicht sich selbst als zu gut, um sich selbst mit den Schwächen & Infirmitäten seiner Nachbarn zu machen, sondern sie mit ihnen, anstatt nur in der Sorge zu sein, sich selbst zu betrachten. Es ist nicht zu viel, für ihn zu leiden, Schmach für unsere Sünden, how

shall it be too much for us to trouble ourselves with the weakness of our brother?"

The application of the Psalm passage to the typology is in v. 4 with the remark: "ὅτι (ὅτι ἡ προφητεία, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδάσκοντες ἐγγράφοντες, etc. "Denn Alles was zuvor geschrieben ist, ist zum unsern Belehrung geschrieben," etc. ("For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning," etc.) Everything that has been written previously, in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, has been written for our learning, who are living at the present time. The ἡ προφητεία has its correlate in ἡμετέραν. Moreover the prophets have secured not only their contemporaries, their people with that which they have written, but the Holy Spirit, the superior & real Author of the Scriptures, has also looked to us, the children of the New Testament. The Scriptures, and that then also applies to the N. T. Scriptures, are the teachers of the Church of all times. One could wonder that Paul, after he had already introduced so many Scripture passages, now first remarks that the Scriptures are designated for our learning, & that he remarks it in general. For the Christians from the beginning had never heard otherwise of the Christian doctrine, the Gospel of Christ, except in connection with the O. T. Scriptures. But therefore it is to be considered that the Apostles were accustomed to emphasize repeatedly, such well known, basic truths as that the Scriptures are God's Word & the source of all doctrine in that it was well known to the Spirit of God who spoke through them, — that the enemy of God & of man, the enemy of our salvation is always working to the point to shake the foundation of our faith. And it is very apt that Paul, after he had verified all the principles of his instruction & admonition with quotations from Scripture, now at the end of his presentation especially points to the fact that such use of the Scriptures corresponds to the purpose of the Scriptures, as he had already in the beginning of his Letter called attention to the agreement of his Gospel with the writings of the prophets.

While this apostle does not speak here in general concerning the correct use, advantage & blessing of the Scriptures, so that one can view with full right the sentence in v. 4, as many expositors do, as a derivation, from which he returns in v. 5 to his theme again, but the foregoing statement concerning the Scriptures lies in close relationship to the admonition in v. 1 ff., that we Christians should bear the infirmities of the incapable & not live to please only ourselves. The general statement, that everything that has been written before-hand has been written for our learning, receives its closer designation thru the added purpose clause: *ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς πληροφορίας τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν*, "damit wir durch die Geduld und durch den Wort der Schrift die Hoffnung festhalten" ("that we thru patience & comfort of the Scriptures might have hope"). According to the context in v. 4 we have to think of the same instruction which the Scriptures impart to us concerning the Christian conduct. Therefore it applies in general, that the Scriptures, because they are God's Word, at the same time work in us what they teach us, to which they admonish us, that the Scriptures make the man of God capable for all good works. And thus the Script-

we especially also work patience, in that they admonish us to patience, & they speak courage, in that they hold out to us, for example, examples of patience, like the patience of Christ; they make us comforted & happy to take upon us all things that we as Christians should take upon ourselves. "The patience & comfort of the Christians" is the patience & comfort which the Scriptures instill into us. In this manner we should be established in the position (v. 4) and we are actually placed into the position to firmly hold on to the hope, the hope of the future glory, which awaits us at the end of this thorn-filled earthly pilgrimage. Patience certainly works experience, but experience works hope, 5, 2. Ἐπεὶ, which in profane Greek according to Passow often "is used both of the temporary holding & of the continual possession," also in the N. T. now & then has the significance of κατέχευ. Cf. Luke 19, 20; John 14, 21; 1 Tim. 3, 9; 11 Tim. 1, 13; Rom. 4, 9; 12, 17; 19, 10. Still in our language under ὑπομονή the Greek does not understand patience in general, patience in cross & suffering, but according to v. 1 the endurance & bearing of the infirmities of the weak, with which the cure of these infirmities is aimed at. This continual work of love, this daily drawing out of the mote & thorn is also an affliction, a burden which we might often shake off of ourselves. But if we zealously look into the Scriptures, then day by day we draw out of them new power, comfort, & exhortation, courage & confidence, & steadily hold before our eyes the blessed goal, where we then with our brethren, free from all the infirmities & troubles of our salvation, shall rejoice in the perfect salvation.

The admonition, which was begun in v. 1, the Apostle closes in v. 5 with the wish: Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δώη ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ ὅσον εἶν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ κριτὸν Ἰησοῦν. "Der Gott aber der Geduld und der Tröstung gebe euch, gleichgeimigt zu sein unter einander nach Christus Jesus" ("Now the God of patience & consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus"). The same spirit, as first to the Scriptures, is now ascribed to God. As the discussion was previously concerning the patience & comfort of the Scriptures, thus God is now named the God of patience & comfort. The Scriptures, which spring from God, have a divine nature. The work of the Scriptures is God's work, God reveals & gives Himself to us thru the Scriptures & thru the Scriptures, thru the teaching of the Scriptures, works & guarantees patience & comfort. And now the Apostle wishes his Christian readers that the God of patience & comfort might give them to be like-minded toward one another, that is, that they look upon one another as brethren & be minded as brethren toward one another. Such brotherly concord is supposition & foundation of the mutual bearing, of the mutual help & edification, & is in general the ornament & embellishment of the Christian congregation and pleasing to God. It becomes the Christians to be united κατὰ κριτὸν Ἰησοῦν, that does not mean according to the image of Christ, for non unus aliquis concordiam probare potest, sed esse debet cum quo concorditer vivat (Fritzsche), but according to the will of Christ, who has even requested this of His own, that they shall be one, John 17, 11. In this manner it then comes about that they unanimously glorify God with one mouth, ἵνα ὁμοῦ ὁμῶς δὴν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζετε τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἰσοῦ. v. 6. That is the real God-pleasing worship, that the entire congregation as with one mouth, out of one

mind & heart, glorify the God & Father of Jesus Christ, who know their Lord Jesus Christ is also their God and Father. We refer last of all both the article τοῦ and the genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν etc. to θεὸν καὶ πατέρα. Also in Eph. 1, 3, 17 God is called not only the Father, but also the God of our Lord Jesus Christ. God stands over against Jesus Christ in a unique relationship, & certainly in the relationship that He is the Father of Jesus Christ.

V.V. 2-13.

In v. 4 the Epistle returns to admonition, still this now runs very general: Διὸ προσήν, βίβλος ἐστὶν ἡμῶν, "Illum, so that the unanimous praise of God might be attained, in what commands and 'Wherefore receive ye one another', to a Christian, brotherly communion, live & come & go very friendly and brotherly with one another. The Christians in general are here addressed. The difference between strong & weak had already receded at the end of the foregoing section. Receive one another, in such Christian such aufgenömmenheit 'as Christ also received us', καὶ οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, προσελήβετο ἡμᾶς. It makes no actual difference whether one reads ἡμᾶς or ἡμῶν, as the copyists have often interchanged ἡμῶν and ἡμᾶς with one another. The same persons as previously are meant, the Christians. Christ has received us, sibi sociavit, in amicitiam suam recepit (Fritzsche), and certainly eis. Σὺν θεῷ, to the praise of God, to the glory of God. We Christians are called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. 1 Cor. 1, 9. Thus we are obligated to maintain & to foster fellowship also with one another. What Christ has done to us is specialized & amplified more closely in the following. With λέγω γάρ, or, what arrives at the same point, λέγω δέ, Paul points out that he would now show how he meant what was just said. λέγω γάρ, ἵνα οὖν Χριστοῦ Σίχκοναν γεγενῆσθαι περὶ τοῦ ἡγούμενου θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν πτερόν, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἡμῶν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐκείνου. Σὺς ἡμεῖς τὸν θεόν. V. 3. 2a. What concerns the structure of this statement is so evident, that Paul would here bring to expression, that Christ had first turned the Jews, then also the Gentiles, & that the second infinitive clause, which is likewise dependent upon λέγω γάρ, would be complemented out of the first one, or also turned around. Fritzsche very correctly remarks: Duo Paulus dixit: unum, Judaeis Christianis consulens, ut Deo sacralitatem in luce collocaret, alterum, gentilibus in amicitiam a Christo receptor, pro benevolentia Deum celebrare. ... Paulus, ut ingenui scriptores facere solent, oratione in brevis contracta ea non expressis verbis dixit quae attentis lectoribus facile consequenter. ... Haud scriptor qui lector ex cuius ingenuitate atque estimatore tantum intelligere, quantum expressis verbis dictum esset, putaret. V. 3. 2b. putide in hunc fore modum deducunt: λέγω δέ, Χριστοῦ Σίχκοναν γεγενῆσθαι περὶ τοῦ ἡγούμενου θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν πτερόν, ἵνα αἱ ἐκ περὶ τοῦ ἡγούμενου θεοῦ, ἵνα αἱ ἐκ περὶ τοῦ ἡγούμενου θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ ἐν δειξάσθαι τὴν γρηγοράτην τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα αἱ

ἐδυνάμει ἐνέπ' ἐλέου, σοφίας δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ. Christ had thus first of all become a minister of the circumcision. In the days of His flesh He had served & preached to the Jews; He had been sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, Matt. 15, 24, and thus His Word He had gathered a group of disciples about Himself out of Israel. The apostles of Christ have then continued the ministry of Christ to the Circumcision, in that they first of all proclaimed the Gospel of Christ to the Jews & first of all established the Church of Christ in Israel. The discussion here of that ministry which had previously been designated with ὑποεπίθετο In the given manner, however, Christ had served the Jews ἐν ἡμῶν ἀποστολῇ, in the interest of the truth, that is, of the veracity of God, for the glorification of the divine truth, namely, in order to confirm the promises of the fathers. The fathers of Israel had already received the promise. Thus His promise God had, as it were, obligated Himself to Israel, so that Israel had a sort of claim on Christ & the salvation in Christ. Certainly, the promise had been given by grace, still after God had once given it, freely, gratuitously. He was indebted to His veracity to fulfill it. And now the believing Jews, who had joined themselves to Christ, or much rather whom Christ had joined to Himself, had received into His fellowship, have become partakers of the promised salvation & praise God for His truthfulness. Concerning the Gentiles, on the other hand, the apostles say that they praise God for His mercy's sake. To the Gentiles, no promise had been given. Certainly in the first promise which had come to the fathers of Israel, this also was foreseen that through Abraham's seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed. But even this promise was revealed only to Israel, but not to the Gentiles. Therefore, the Gentiles praise God for His mercy's sake, that to them out of nothing but divine grace the same benefit, the same salvation has fallen as to Israel. It has come to such praise of God among the heathen, as it is shown in the context, likewise through the ministry of Christ. In order to glorify the grace of God, Christ has sent out messengers of salvation into all lands, & through the preaching of the Gospel has gathered for Himself a people of possession out of all the nations of the earth. Benigne, pater gentibus (Christus), quia per misericordiam suam speciali promissione ad societatem populi sui vocavit et admittit, ut et hoc quoque confiteantur et glorificent Deum. Körner.

And now in v. 8 bff. the apostle again takes recourse to the Scriptures and, as in 7, 25, 26; 10, 29, once again expressly calls attention to the fact that the great & wonderful work of Christ, which even at his time was in full swing, the conversion of the Gentiles, the blossoming forth of the Gentile Church, in which the praise of the mercy of God sounded forth, was already attested by Moses & the prophets, & that thereby the eternal counsel of God was being fulfilled. The first quotation is taken from Ps. 18, where the speech of David changes into the speech of the Son of David. With the words: "Datum will ich dich bekennen unter den Völkern und dein Name singen" ("For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles and sing unto thy name"), Ps. 18, 50, the Messiah praises the God of His salvation, v. 47, the help that He had experienced from God, v. 49, and so certainly among the nations of the Gentiles, for whom that which God had done to Him should serve for salvation. A parallel to this is the second half of the 22. Psalm, where in a similar manner this work of the

called Christ, the gathering of the Gentile Church is described. The message of salvation, which Christ permitted to go out into the world of the Gentiles, then raised up their hymn of praise of the Gentiles, of which the two following Scripture passages testify: "Hochlobet, ihr Völker, mit seinem Volk." ("Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people." Deut. 32, 43. "Lobet den Herrn, alle Völker, und es sollen ihm loben, EPIXIV 6XTN 6XV, alle Nationen." ("Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; & bow him, all ye people." Ps. 117, 1. The first passage reads according to the original text: ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΤΕ ΤΩ ΚΥ, ΠΙΣΤΙΣΤΕ ΤΩ ΚΥ, which would say: Rejoice, ye Gentiles, His people or you who are His people. Paul adopts the translation of the Septuagint: ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΤΕ ΕΝ ΚΥ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩ ΛΟΓΩ ΑΥΤΟΥ, which brings into expression even the thought which he urges in the context, namely, that the Gentiles should praise God together with Israel as one people & as one congregation. The sense of the original text is not thereby altered, in that the Gentiles even thereby that they glorify God with the people of God, prove themselves as those who belong to the people of God. The fourth quotation is the statement of the Prophet Isaiah 11, 10: "Der Wurzel Jesse, daiz, welcher da steht zu einem Banner der Völker, nach dem werden die Heiden tragen." The translation of the Septuagint, which is also accepted here by Paul: ΚΑΙ ΕΞ ΕΝΟΣ ΤΡΥΦΕΥΟΣ ΑΡΧΕΙΤΕ ΕΝ ΚΥ, ΕΠΙ ΑΥΤΩ ΕΘΝΑ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΟΥΟΙΣ, "und da steht, zu herrschen über die Völker, auf ihm werden die Völker hoffen." ("There shall be a root of Jesse, & he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust," gives a thought again, which is often found in prophecy, & fits even into the foregoing context. Christ, the root of Jesse, shall extend His reign among the nations of the Gentiles, thru Word & preaching, & this result & effect will then be that the Gentiles trust in Him, believe in Him, as their Lord & Savior. Faith thus produces itself in praise & thanksgiving. All four quotations of Scripture thus apply to the fact of the present time mentioned in v. 8, 9 a, that Christ has also become the minister of the Gentiles, & that the Gentiles praise God for His mercy sake.

In that in the foregoing section the Apostle pictures the N. T. Church as a fellowship between believing Israel & the converted Gentiles, who now both together pray to the God & Father of Jesus Christ, therefore it shows of itself, that with the admonition directed to the Christians to receive one another, v. 12, he would also especially recommend the correct brotherly conduct & acceptance between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. Such a monitum was in place everywhere, where Jews & Gentiles were joined together into one congregation, & does not necessarily presume dissensions between the two parties. Moreover, in our section, vv. 7-12, the emphasis does not lie on the admonition, but on the motivations of the same. At the close of the instructions which he had given to the Roman Christians, the Apostle still bears in mind with praise the great & wonderful mystery, concerning which he had elaborated to a greater extent in others. Letters, such as the letters to the Ephesians & to the Colossians, that Jews & Gentiles are now united into one body, & therefore certainly at the same time impresses upon his Christian readers, who are from such different extractions, an obligation to preserve the unity which stemmed from God thru the bond of peace.

The Apostle concludes his last explanation from v. 10 & in general his entire instructions and

admonitions, which he had permitted to be imparted to the Roman Christians, with a short return, with the wish that the God of hope might fill them with all joy & peace in believing, so that they might be rich in hope in the power of the Holy Spirit. Ο ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος, ἀγαπᾷ ὑμᾶς, πάλιν καὶ ἡμᾶς καὶ εἰρήνην ἔν τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς τὸ περιεσσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν συνάψει πνεύματος ἁγίου. V. 13. Καὶ εἰπὼν, "Friends and Friends", which are here bound together with one another, similarly as in 17, 14, 17, here also designates the inner frame of mind of the Christians. The basis of the Christians is joy, joy in the salvation which has befallen them, Jews as well as Gentiles, & the Christians have peace with God. This peace fills their souls & gives them support & power. In faith they have joy & peace, in their Christian faith, in faith in Christ, in that Christ has mediated to them the salvation in which they rejoice, & the peace with God. And the wish of the Apostle looks to the point that their faith might be strengthened & their joy & peace might be increased, & certainly with the purpose that they might be rich abundantly rich in hope. Whoever rejoices over the present salvation in Christ & has peace with God also confidently hopes for the perfection of that salvation, for the future glory. And in the same measure that joy & peace are increased hope is also strengthened. Certainly this takes place only in the power of the Holy Spirit, that the Christians preserve hope among the manifold perplexities of this time, under which faith must prove itself & which still stand in the way of their glorification. And so the Apostle wishes for & prays for the Christians, as they also themselves pray for it, that the God of hope, who gives & works hope, might make them joyful & full of peace, so that thus in the power of God & His Spirit they look toward & move toward the blessed goal of their destination full of hope & very confidently.

It hardly needs the remark that what is said of the Jews in the foregoing section, that Christ had been first of all a minister of the circumcision, in no way contradicts that which had been said of the Jews in chap. 9-11, as Paul & his adherents suppose. We have also read of the fact in 9, 24 that God has called us who are now Christians out from among Jews & Gentiles; in 11, 2 that God has not rejected His people, whom He had chosen for Himself beforehand; in 11, 5 that also in the present time a remnant remains as a result of the election of grace, etc.

Summary of the section, 15, 1-13: The Apostle admonishes the Christians to bear the infirmities of the weak, & to live & to deal together very brotherly & harmoniously with one another, to present themselves as a unified congregation of God.

15, 14-34. The Epilogue.

W. 14-16.

The Apostle has come to an end with the instructions & admonitions which he had in view. There follows an epilogue, which, as is presented of itself, from its content & is almost generally acknowledged,

applies not to the last exhortation, also not to the parenthetical part of the Letter, Rom 12, 10, but to the entire Letter & corresponds to the introduction of the same, 1, 3-15. By means of the usual *metabasischen* *Sei* Paul adds a vindication of this document of his. The remark in *iv* is only an introduction to that which he states in *v. 15* concerning his Epistle. *Πεπεισμαι* *Sei* *ἡ* *Sei* *βοή* *μου*, thus we read first of all, *καὶ* *αὐτὸς* *ἔγὼ* *περὶ* *ὑμῶν*, *ὅτι* *καὶ* *αὐτοὶ* *μεστὰ* *ἔστε* *ἡγάρ* *θεοῦ* *καὶ* *πνεύματος* *καὶ* *λόγου* *καὶ* *ἀγάπης* *καὶ* *ἐπιστάμεθα* *καὶ* *ἀλλήλους* *νοθετεῖν*. The *καὶ* *αὐτὸς* *ἔγὼ* is evidently has its correlate in the following *καὶ* *αὐτοὶ*. We leave the double *καὶ* best of all as untranslated. The Apostle, for his part is convinced, altho from his Letter one could imagine somewhat the opposite, that his readers, the Roman Christians on their part, also without this instruction & exhortation on his part, found themselves in a good Christian condition. First of all, that they are full of "blessedness" ("goodness"). *ἡγάρομεν*, a word of later formation, means in general "blessedness", "blessedness", "blessedness", and here designates the Christian frame of mind & excellence. The Apostle is further convinced that his readers are filled with all knowledge, that they have correctly learned the Christian truth. The first of the two statements dependent upon *ὅτι* has reference to the immediately preceding parenthetical part of the Letter, according to which it could appear as if it was not all right with the life & conduct of the Roman Christians; the second has reference to the instructive part of the Letter, which could give the impression that the Romans were still far behind in their knowledge. Finally Paul still also expects this of his readers, with all confidence that, where in general guidance in doctrine & life still appeared necessary, they could instruct one another themselves. Thus he did not have in mind to write to them, to speak with Hofmann, "as if they needed his exhortation because of a lack of a correct disposition or his instructions because of a lack of knowledge, or as if he must come to the aid of the impotence of the readers to speak the necessary things with one another with a Letter corresponding to the different needs of the individuals." The good confidence of the Apostle in the Roman Christians rests self-evidently on the knowledge which he possessed concerning the condition of things in Rome, on the communications which he had received from others. And the foremost members of the Roman congregation were personally known to him. It is extremely arbitrary & the utmost foolishness, when Baur would prone the ingenueness of the entire section from this expression concerning the Christianity of the Romans, in that he supposes that a later writer had worked with such a *captatio benevolentiae* to appease the Christians, especially the Jewish Christians in Rome, upon whom Paul's Letter to the Romans had made a poor impression. The confidence of Paul in his readers is well founded & that he has openly stated the same, he has only done well. Students & hearers of the divine Word are only attracted & spurred on to go forward in knowledge & godliness, when their teachers & preachers show trust in them & openly acknowledge that which they have known & gained previously from his grace.

In spite of the good report which he had concerning the Roman Christians, Paul had likewise written

to them, v. 15, and certainly τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐξουσιῶν, which nevertheless did not prejudice the brother-
hood. The repetition of the καὶ ἐκδοῖ is well in place. Most of the expositors take τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ καὶ ἐξουσιῶν
as a strict comparative, but then they must also supply the comparison itself. Meyer & Weiss suppose
that Paul had written more boldly than such a good confidence appeared to bring with itself; Hofmann
he has presumed more than otherwise, "because he did not have the same right to write to this congreg-
ation, which was not founded by him, as with the other letters." It appears to me the most simple & the most
natural to take the comparative with superiority in the sense of "ziemlich" (rather), "ziemlich kühn"
(rather boldly). "Ziemlich Kühn habe ich, Brüder, thutweise an euch geschrieben" (But I have
written to you more boldly in some sort). "The boldness of some sort" one has sought in individ-
ual bold, strong, "weighty" expressions. But we thereby think rather of what parts & amplifications of the
letter. Still the Apostle in the didactic section, where he presented the righteousness of faith, had already
as strongly & energetically as possible all work-righteousness, & in the admonishing part had impressed
on the justified, sanctified Christians emphatically that they must die & be condemned, if they hereafter
still were in & live after the flesh. To the Christian who offends his brother, he had protested that he
thereby helps his brother, for whom Christ has died, to condemnation. A second modifier of

ἐξουσιῶν is εἰς ἐκδοῖ καὶ ἐξουσιῶν. This composite very really: "wider in Erinnerung
rufen", is on a strengthened, v. 16 v. 17. That was the purpose of this document of his. The Apostle
would have reminded his readers of that which they already knew, which they had heard & learned from
others. All Christians who have known the truth & stand & walk in the truth still need the reminder, &
certainly also an express reminder of the known truth, even when no moral back or misunderstanding
is present, so that the Christian knowledge & disposition might be clarified, promoted, & main-
tained. Yes, without a constant reminder the Christians would very soon again lose what they have,
as Luther often testified that his Wittenbergers would soon become heathens again if he would give
up the preaching of the Gospel for only one year. The Christian truth goes even against flesh & blood and soon
disappears out of the heart, if they are not held in by their continued teaching, admonition & reminder.
The reminders submitted in Paul's letters to the Romans, which was inspired by God, can & should, however,
serve the Christians of all times with the intent that they learn to grasp & understand always better & more
basically the very comforting mystery of their justification & redemption, so that they become always more
joyful & more certain of their faith & always more willing & more active to all good works.

But what had really moved, yes, obligated the Apostle to write to the Romans for the purpose mentioned
was the grace which had been given him by God, that he should be a servant of Jesus Christ in relation to the
Gentiles. V. 15, 16. God had imparted to him this special gift & grace; Christ, the Lord & Ruler of the Church,
had assigned to him this service, the office of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Q. 15. That is a priestly service:
"Priesterlich verwaltend das Evangelium Gottes" (ministering the Gospel of God), ἐποπτεύων τοῖς

εὐαγγελιστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. Paul discharged the duties of a priest, that is, proclaimed the Gospel of God. Nevertheless, the Gospel is not a sacrifice which Paul presented, but a ^{considered as} means instrument (through which the intended sacrifice is prepared & made ready). It reads further: ἵνα γένηται ὁ προσφορὰ τῶν ἑθνῶν, "damit zustande komme der Opfer der Heiden" ("that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable"). Τὸ γένεσθαι here has an independent meaning. It treats first of the fact that an offering should be presented, should be accomplished, the nature of the offering is only the second thing. The offering at which it was aimed with the preaching of Paul among the Gentiles, is the Gentiles themselves. The genitive τῶν ἑθνῶν is the genitive of apposition. And that is, as the two following oppositional modifiers state, a well-pleasing sacrifice, sanctified in the Holy Spirit, εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἡγιασμένον. εἰς πνεῦμα ἁγίου. The Holy Spirit has sanctified the hearts of the Gentiles, has consecrated them to God. Therefore God has special pleasure in the offering of the Gentiles. Thus the proclamation of the Gospel, & that applies to every proclamation of the Gospel, the Holy Spirit is given, & through the Holy Spirit the hearts of men are sanctified, renewed, converted to God, added to God, as it were, presented as gifts & sacrifices to God. The Roman Christians had already become such an offering, before Paul wrote to them, through the Word, which they had received from others. Nevertheless Paul had claim & call to the Gentiles in general. Thus it belonged to his office also to instruct the converted Gentiles & to strengthen them, so that they remain what they are, & they always become more a well-pleasing, sanctified offering to God. Therefore he had written to the Romans.

By virtue of his office as Apostle to the Gentiles Paul had written to the Romans & imparted to them the instruction & admonitions contained in this Letter, & so that his readers might correctly recognize this grace, which had been given him by God, he expresses himself still further concerning that fact & points especially to the results of the former activity of this office of his. He continues: Ἐγὼ οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ θεῷ πατρί. ἔχω μὲν ῥῆμα ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ. V. 17. "Ich habe nun Ruhm in Christo Jesus in dem, was Gott befreit" ("I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ in those things which pertain to God"). As Paul was appointed by God as the Apostle of the Gentiles & entrusted with the Gospel of Christ, he could now also boast in the affairs of God, with reference to the call which God had granted him. Certainly this boasting of his on all his activity & works, was resolved in Christ Jesus. How much he had reason to boast is shown by the statement in V. 12, 13. The purpose of his calling had also been realized. He had accomplished much: "zum Gehorsam der Heiden" ("to make the Gentiles obedient"), in order to establish the obedience of faith among the Gentiles. He had brought many Gentiles to faith "mit Wort und Werk" ("by word & deed"), above all through his preaching, then also through the example of his life & conduct, which

confirmed his doctrine, as also in Kraft von Zeichen und Wundern ("thru mighty signs & wonders"), which strengthened the impressions of his speech. Nevertheless not in his own power, but "in der Kraft des heiligen Geistes" or, as another reading has it, "des Heiligen Geistes" ("by the power of the Spirit of God"). The Holy Spirit, who alone works faith, works & operates in the word & work of the preacher of the Gospel. In order to turn all praise away from his own person & from his own activity, the Apostle introduces this statement concerning his activity with the words: οὐ γὰρ τοῦ ἑωὶ δαλεῖν τι αὐτὸν οὐ κατ-εἰρηγὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Σὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς ὑπὸ καὶ ἔθνη. Thus, he is minded, he will & would in no case speak anything, boast of anything which Christ had not accomplished thru him. What he had accom- plished in his office, that Christ had brought to pass thru him, Christ & His Spirit. The preachers of the Gospel are instruments of Christ.

What he had previously accomplished thru word & work, in the power of Christ & of the Spirit of God, the result of his previous activity of his office, Paul now in v. 16 comprehends in the words: ὡς τε με ἔτι τοῦ ἔργου καὶ ἔτι καὶ κῆρυγμα ἐξ ἑμοῦ τοῦ ἡλίου κοῦ πεπληρωμένον, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. From Jerusalem to Illyricum he had fulfilled the Gospel of Christ. He mentions the starting point & the farthest point of his career. From Jerusalem in general had the Word of God gone out. In Jerusalem

Christ had said to Paul: "Report for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles" Acts 22:21. In Jeru- salem Paul had given up powerful testimony concerning Christ. Acts 13:16. Then he had gone out into the lands of the Gentiles & had preached on as far as Illyricum. The province of Illyricum, which the Apostle had sought out from Macedonia or Thracia, formed the farthest boundary of the eastern half of the Roman Empire. Between "Jerusalem" and "Illyricum" there is still inserted the expression καὶ κῆρυγμα. The καὶ καὶ κῆρυγμα does not really refer back to ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἔτι, so that the neighborhood of Jerusalem, or even Syria and Arabia, would be meant, but we rather understand it with Hofmann & other expositors, corresponding to the content of the fact that Paul from Jerusalem to Illyricum, describing a circle, had gone thru the inter- mediate lands with the preaching of the Gospel, had made the wide circuit of the Roman Orient. But the Apostle does not now say that he had preached the Gospel in the lands mentioned, but that on this wide circuit he had fulfilled the Gospel of Christ. ἡ ὑποῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον does not mean simply "das Evan- gelium verkündigen", as that the same would be regarded as an empty vessel, which first received its fulness with his proclamation, but signifies, as Schierlitz shows, "das Evangelium ausrichten, voll- bringen, bis ans Ende führen", or, as Hofmann explains it more closely, ad finem perducere evangelium,

effere, ut ubique immetatur, approbatur, apprehendatur. "The ἡ ὑποῖς is used extensively, in this way, that the Gospel is proclaimed everywhere from Jerusalem to Illyricum & brought to acceptance. Analogous is the idiom: ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσχευε, Acts 6:7, 12, 24, 19, 20. As long as the message of salva- tion is carried in sphere from place to place, it is conceived in growth & increasing; but it is brought every- where, so that no place remains for spreading (v. 23), thus it has entered fulfillment out of the growing

process. Meyer. Compare the expression $\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu$, Col. 1, 25. The Gospel appears here, as
Kodet correctly remarks, as a task which would be fulfilled, completed. The Gospel has a mission
to all the nations of the earth & that consists in the fact that it shall be known & accepted everywhere.
Certainly not all the Gentiles who hear the Gospel accept the same, but only those who belong to the $\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$
 $\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omega\upsilon$, 11, 25. When the full number of the Gentiles has entered into the Kingdom of God, has come to
faith, together with the $\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$, then the Gospel has fulfilled its mission on earth. And thus Paul
on his part had fulfilled the task of the Gospel in all lands between Jerusalem & Illyricum. He had not
preached & worked in all places of the Roman Orient but established the Christian Church only in the
principal cities from thence it could easily spread farther into the neighborhood of itself.

In this missionary activity of his, which he had brought to an end in the Orient, Paul, as he still
adds in vv. 22, 21, had been diligent, & he places his glory therein, to preach the Gospel only & only there
where Christ was not named, where the name of Christ was still not known; $\sigma\tau\iota\omega\ \delta\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\nu$
 $\epsilon\ \xi\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omega\upsilon$, $\alpha\upsilon\chi\ \delta\iota\sigma\tau\omega\ \omega\upsilon\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \chi\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. He would not build upon a strange foundation. He
would not entrench upon the work of another. He followed the maxim expressed in Mat. 5, 21, 5 : "Nemo
necit mercedem suam, die solent scire, unde die nescit, habet, solent nescire, unde die nescire."
he was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand. The Apostle
quotes here according to the Septuagint. According to the original text the words read: in die nescire
 $\text{ergo nescit, unde die nescire, unde die nescire, ergo nescire}$. Both statements give essentially the
same sense. The kings & peoples, this the prophet foretells, shall at one time see something, that means,
become aware of, perceive something, which had not been announced to them until that time, namely, the
message concerning the servant of God. The principle applied here, according to which he regulated
himself especially in his missionary activity, self-evidently does not exclude the fact that Paul also wrote
letters to those congregations which were not founded by him, like the Roman & Ephesian & on his pass-
ing thru imparted $\chi\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. He was certainly, according to the grace granted him
from God, the apostle & teacher of the Gentiles $\kappa\alpha\tau'\ \epsilon\ \xi\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$.

After Paul had looked back to his previous missionary activity, he now looks into the future & imparts
to his readers his plan of travel. Until now he had enough to do in the Orient, therefore he had been
hindered from coming to Rome. V. 22. It reads: $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\iota\ \tau\epsilon\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\iota$ is not as much
as $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\iota$, 1, 13, but signifies only plurimum , "meistens", "generally". "I have much." The reason men-
tioned had held him back from it in most cases, when an opportunity offered itself for a journey to
Rome, altho now & then other hindrances had placed themselves in the way. But now he had brought

his work in the Orient to an end, "in diesen Gegenden" ("in these parts"), from Jerusalem to Syria, there was no longer room for action. And therefore he had long had the desire to visit the Roman congregation, so now, as soon as he traveled to Spain, he would comply with this desire. That is evidently the sense of the expression in vv. 23, 24a. Nevertheless it is very questionable how the words read separately. The lectio recepta reads: Νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τοῦ τοῖς, ἐπιποθεῖν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἔτων, ὡς ἔαν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπυρίαν, ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. According to this text form the speech runs very smoothly. "Jetzt aber, da ich keinen Raum mehr habe in diesen Gegenden... werde ich, sobald ich nach Spanien reise, zu euch kommen" ("But now, having no more place in these parts... whenever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you"). But the last words, ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, are very weakly confirmed, are lacking in A B C D E F G, in many translations and in several of the fathers. Therefore many expositors have sought the continuation of the statement in vv. 23, 24a in the following. Bruchbach, Knapp, & others read: ὡς ἔαν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπυρίαν, ἐλπίζω δὲ πορεύομενος θεῶν ὑμᾶς, etc., in that they eliminate the γὰρ before ἐλπίζω. "Sobald ich nach Spanien reise, hoffe ich auf der Durchreise euch zu sehen", etc. But this γὰρ is sufficiently attested by A B C D E. Therefore the elimination of the same is very largely arbitrary. Sachmann & Hofmann think that after the parenthesis in v. 24b the Νυνὶ δὲ in v. 23 is again taken up with the Νυνὶ δὲ in v. 25 and the statement begun there is brought to an end with πορεύωμαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Nevertheless, looking away from the forced construction, still the πορεύωμαι in v. 25, the journey to Jerusalem, is an entirely different journey than the one intended according to vv. 23, 24a. With most of the expositors we take the apostolos contained in ὡς ἔαν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπυρίαν as an anacoluthon, which supplements itself of itself. The speaker had previously twice written τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, and thus in the apostolos the ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς was still in his mind. The meaning is: Since I have had the desire for a long time to come to you, therefore, as soon as I journey to Spain, I will also come to you. The statement in v. 24b is the explanation of the foregoing. "Denn ich hoffe auf der Durchreise euch zu sehen und nun euch" - really: now euch aus, ἃ ἔστι ὑμῶν. - "for this I expect to see you, when I journey on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company". That is the travel plan of the Apostle. After he had fulfilled his missions in the eastern half of the Roman Empire, he would now also fulfill the Gospel of Christ in the western half, first of all in Spain, where the name of Christ was still unknown. The way to Spain led him to Rome. Therefore on the journey through Rome he would enjoy for a little while the personal intercourse with the Roman Christians & hoped then that delegates of the local congregations might accompany him to Spain & that they might support him for the first in his missionary work in the far west. According to reasonably certain tradition Paul has also actually done missionary work in Spain, yes,

has perhaps preceded even to Britain. To Rome he certainly came in a different manner than he first considered it. Nevertheless what he writes further already foreshadows the fact that the projected Roman-Spanish journey would not pass by entirely smoothly & peacefully.

Before the Apostle set out for the West, he must first carry out an errand in the East. Vv. 25-29. He was now about to journey to Jerusalem for the ministry of the saints, for the local Christians Macedonia & Achaia had decided to arrange a collection for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem. Κοινωνία, in our passage, as in 1 Cor. 8, 9, signifies "Collecte," collatio, quippe quia ecclesiarum communione documentum. Primum. The contributors entered into communion with the one supported, insofar as he Κοινωνεῖται τοῖς ἁγίοις, 12, 13. To Κοινωνία Paul still adds τίς, "einwagwissem Betrag" ("a certain contribution"), & with that points to the fact that this gift, if it was very considerable in itself in the great liberality of the Macedonian congregations, was still only small in comparison with that which the Macedonians & Achaians owed to Jerusalem. Concerning this collection he also speaks in 1 Cor. 13; 11 Cor. 8, 9. The congregations of Macedonia had decided that, if it had thus pleased them, they had done it with a good will, ἐὶς δόξαν: on the other hand, they also owed it to the brethren in Jerusalem. In Jerusalem was the mother church of Christianity, so that thus the spiritual blessings of Christianity spread out from Jerusalem over the κόσμος. Meyer. Therefore it is only right & just that the converted Gentiles with their physical blessings serve those from whom they had received a share in their spiritual blessings. Now when the Apostle had carried out this business & had sealed this fruit, this proof of brotherly love to the saints in Jerusalem, he would travel from Rome to Spain. The act of surrendering itself was the offering of the collection for the recipients. The presentation of the coins they were really confirmed to the recipients as the fruit gathered for them on the part of the growth as with an offered seal. Weiss. Paul still adds: "Ich weiss aber, dass wenn ich komme, ich mit der Fülle der Barmherzigkeit Christi kommen werde." ("I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ"). He shall bring the full blessing of Christ with him. The longer he had distanced from the personal intercourse with the Roman Christians, just so much happier would he be when he was with them to open his mouth to them. He is convinced that Christ, who turned His blessing toward the Gentiles thru him, the Apostle to the Gentiles, would permit such a measure of blessing to come to the Romans.

With much apprehension the Apostle prepared for the journey to Rome. After previous experience he must be prepared for hostilities & plots on the part of the unbelieving Jews in Jerusalem, especially of the leaders of the Jews. He must also fear that the gift of love of the Gentiles might not be welcome to all the Christians in Jerusalem. For there were in the local congregations Judaistically minded Christians who regarded the work of Paul among the Gentiles with mistrust. And therefore he still demanded of his brethren in Rome that they accompany him on his journey with their prayer. Vv. 30-32. He ad-

476.
16.1.2. 3-16.

of Christians, resp. Christian families, that one does not need to accept with Juelicher "a migration of Christians" out of the East to Rome, & that the Epistle could likewise regard & deal with the Roman congregation as a whole correctly as a congregation unknown to him personally. Against the hypothesis contained in this there stands directly the fact that it cannot in any way be explained how a document intended for the Christians in Ephesus should have been introduced into the Letter to the Romans. We therefore hold in agreement with all witnesses & with most of the commentators the entire 16. chapter as a constituent part of the Letter to the Romans.

V. 1.2. The Commendation of Phoebe.

The Epistle has come to an end with his document. Now he still adds some personal matters. First of all, an introduction of Phoebe, who in all probability was the deliverer of this Letter. The Roman Christians should receive her in the Lord, as it was becoming to saints, should show her not only outward hospitality, but regard her as a sister, as a fellow Christian & worthy because of her service. Phoebe was a deaconess. *Σκηνος*, a benefactor of the poor, sick, & strangers, in the congregation at Lenchrea, the eastern port-city of Corinth. Thus the brethren in Rome might also especially give her assistance, if she needed them in some business, & thereby repay her for the faithful service which she had rendered to many Christians of her own congregation & also to the Epistle himself. Probably Paul had once been sick during his stay in Lenchrea. It reads: *πρόστίς ἐγὲν ὅτι*, which means: "Patronis", "patron", "sonnerin", "patroness", "Fürsorgerin", "provider", "Pflegerin", "nurse".

V. 3-16. Greetings of the Epistle.

There follow here a list of greetings, which contains names of Christians, who stood close to the Apostle, who were mostly well known to him personally, & who lived in Rome at the time. Even because he had still not seen the Roman congregation explained itself that Paul greets by name the members of the same who were known to him. When he wrote to congregations which he himself had established & knew personally, it never came to his mind to separate a number of congregation members & distinguish them by special greetings. At the same time, in that he asserts all the personal connections which he had, he would draw more closely the bond with the Roman congregation, which lay very near to his heart.

The first greeting, vv. 3-5, applies to the Jewish couple, Aquila & Priscilla, who are well known to us from the Acts of the Apostles. They had been driven from Rome by the edict of banishment of Emperor Claudius & had come together with the Apostle in Corinth & certainly through his ministry had been won for the Lord. Then Paul had taken them with him to Ephesus, where they developed a zealous Christian activity, for example, to instruct Apollos in the way of God, to open their house for Christian gatherings. Acts 18, 1 ff. 19 ff.

24 ff; 1 Cor. 16, 19. Now we find them again in Rome. It was very natural that, after the edict of Claudius had lost its power, they had returned to their former place of residence. And since they were evidently rich a journey from Rome to Ephesus offered no difficulty, therefore it is also not strange that they once again several years later visited the Ephesian congregation, which had become very dear to them during their exile. 1 Tim. 4, 19. In our passage, as also in 1 Tim. 4, 19, Paul mentions Priscilla or Prisca in the first place, probably because she was more zealous in the promotion of the cause of Christ than her husband. He commends both of them to the Roman Christians as his helpers in Christ Jesus, as his co-workers in the Gospel, & remembers an especial service of love, which he had received from them. They had once, probably in Ephesus, delivered him from a danger to life with peril of their own lives. In this figurative sense we take with most expositors the words: οἱ τίνας ἐν ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἡμετέρας, ποὺ τὸν ἐκείνους τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐν ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων, 'welche für mein Leben ich Hülfe gegeben' ('who have for my life laid down their own necks'), really laid under the executioner's axe. For this all Gentile congregations owe them thanks, in that they have preserved the life of the Epistle to the Gentiles. At the same time Paul greets 'die Gemeinde in ihrem Haus' ('the church that is in their house'), τῶν καὶ οἴκου αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν, which was otherwise unknown to him. In larger cities the worship gatherings of the Christians were held in different locations, because one house did not hold them. As in Ephesus, thus in Rome also Priscilla and Priscilla offered their house for such an assembly of a part of the local congregation.

The persons enumerated in vv. 5 b-15 are otherwise altogether unknown to us. It is entirely arbitrary, when Hofmann assigns those named in vv. 5 b-13 to the house-congregation mentioned in v. 5 a. Epaphroditus means ἐπαφροδίτης τῶν ἡμετέρων, the first fruits of Asia in reference to Christ, for Christ. He was the first of the Asiae converted to Christ, was therefore a Gentile Christian, in that with him began the winning of Asia, that is, the Roman province of Asia, for Christ. Asia appears as a Gentile land, even the Jews lived therein. The reading τῶν ἡμετέρων is by far more attested than the other: τῶν ἡμετέρων. Concerning Mary, according to her name, a Jewish Christian, it is remarked that she had bestowed much labor on the Epistle. Andronicus & Junia Paul calls his kinsmen, τοῖς συγγενεῖς μου, that is fellow countrymen, cf. 9, 3, with a view 'to emphasize the twofold communion, by virtue of which he greets them.' Hofmann. They belonged first of all to the same nation & were on the other hand his fellow prisoners, that is as he himself had been won from the world, from Judaism by Christ. In this figurative interpretation the expression συγγενεῖς μου has, since ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων, as Hofmann correctly remarks, always designates only the prisoners of war. Where Paul considers his physical imprisonment, he always calls himself ὁ δεσμώτης. These two fellow countrymen & fellow Christians of the Epistle were acknowledged most honorably by the Epistle, the Twelve, ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, as they had already been believers in Christ before Paul. While the Epistle mentions Amplias simply as his beloved in the Lord, & Stachys as his beloved, concerning Urbanus he calls attention to the fact that he had been active with him in the service of Christ, con-

Epheles, that he had proven himself in Christ as a Christian. With τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Ἰερουσαλὶμ and τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Νεγκισβου are meant people from the domestic church, really the slaves of Aristobulus and Narcissus, who had become Christians & were known to the Apostle. It is very questionable whether this Narcissus is identical with the powerful freedman of Claudius, concerning whom Sueton reports, Claud. 28, & Tacitus, in his Annals, 12, 57. Such simple brethren, Christian slaves, are just as beloved & worthy to Paul & he would also have them regarded worthy by the Roman congregation as men who have a name & reputation in the Church. When he further calls Herodion his kinsman, then it is not thereby said that all the persons, with whom this epithet is lacking, had been Gentile Christians. Tryphena & Tryphosa labored honorably in the Lord in the service of the Lord. Persea, the beloved, had labored much in the Lord. Among the faithful laborers, one is still more zealous than the other. Self-evidently we here have to think of a Christian activity suitable to a Christian woman, not specially of the preaching of the Word. Very probably Rufus is the son of that Simon of Cyrene, who carried the cross for the Lord, & whom Mark still not by chance names as the father of Alexander & Rufus, 16, 21. Then the epithet, "chosen in the Lord," is much the more in place, in that the guidance, by which Simon & his family were led to Christ appears as a very apparent proof of his election. The mother of Rufus had shown motherly love & care to the Apostle, perhaps in Jerusalem, therefore he also calls her his mother. In vv. 14, 15 there are still two groups of names introduced, save that no distinguishing predication is added to them, as to the preceding. From these latter circumstances we dare not conclude that the Apostle had not regarded these persons, like those previously named, as dear Christians, as beloved in the Lord, but only that they were farther from him, were not so familiar with him. The double addition "und die Brüder mit ihnen" ("and the brethren which are with them") & "die Heiligen mit ihnen alle" ("and all the saints which are with them"), point to a second & third house congregation. Paul finally offers his greeting to the entire Roman congregation. And the Roman Christians should now attest a more themselves the communion of love, which he had thereby attested to them, by means of the holy kiss, but should be an expression & seal not of the natural, but of the Christian communion of love. The foregoing section closes with the words: "Ἐγέρσεως εὐχὴ διὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός" ("The churches of Christ salute you"). Even if one does not read the text, still the Christian congregation in general are meant. Without doubt express greetings were conveyed to the Gentiles by many congregations, which knew of his plan to journey to Rome or to write there. Of the rest applies what Erasmus says: Quoniam cognovit omnium erga Romanos studium, omnium nomine salutatur.

Vv. 17-20. Warning against False Teachers

The 16. chapter according to some explanation is a "chapter of fraternal correction" called. Still in this supplement to his document the Apostle adds a warning against false teachers. He admonishes his brethren

to be careful concerning those who introduce a doctrine which is contrary to the Christian doctrine which they had received & thereby cause divisions & give offense, giving occasion for a fall, for apostasy from the truth. That this warning is so shortly comprehended & added on by way of supplement, shows, as, for example, also Philippi, Meyer, Hyman & Luthardt call attention to the fact, that in the Roman congregation false teachers had still not found an entrance. The description of the same is regarded as ~~strange~~ general, that one cannot think expressly of Jewish adversaries of the Gospel. "The deviations from the sound, uniform doctrine could just as well be of a heathen origin & had along the erroneous pathway of insubordination as the way of salvation & the righteousness of faith would be obstructed thru Jewish legalism." Hyman. The articles ταῖς τῶν Σινοβιτιανῶν καὶ τῶν ἑκείνων... ποιοῦντες point to this genus of teachers, the false teachers & destroyers of the peace. St. Paul certainly hereby thinks of such opponents, like those who had already previously stood in the way of his Gospel, like the false teachers & hypocrites from the circumcision, who had disrupted the congregations of Balaam & Achana, or like the deniers of the resurrection, whom he opposes with the first Letter to the Corinthians, whose error was no doubt of heathen origin. And if the Roman Christians were still not directly threatened, then still it could easily happen that false teachers of both kinds might turn their aim on the Christian congregation of the world capital, which made itself spoken of everywhere & might seek to make their propaganda also there. And then when this condition enters in, then the Roman Christians should really keep an eye on, ὁρῶντες, the teachers, who bring a new, strange doctrine, in order to guard themselves against them, & they should abandon them, ἐκκλίνετε ἀπ' αὐτῶν, not hear them, have no communion with them. Therefore he stands first in order, that the Christians should avoid not only false doctrine, but also false teachers & consequently also hold themselves separate from such church memberships, in which or wherever doctrine and false teachers are permitted. All unionism, which unites truth & error in the same ecclesiastical organization, is condemned by this word of the Apostle, & that is God's Word. We read similar warnings in 11 Thess. 3, 6; Tit. 3, 10; 1 Cor. 5, 11; 11 John 10.

Why one should turn away from false teachers, Paul shows in v. 18. They do not serve our Lord Jesus Christ, as it is fitting, & as they somewhat pretend, but they serve their own belly. It is not their intention to win souls for the Lord Christ, but they provide for their own benefit, their own desires; they seek only to build up a large following for themselves in order to have a life of pleasure & good days. They deceive the hearts of the innocent, who look for no deceit from them, by glowing words, sermo speciosus, ῥησολογία, and "δὲ λόγος καλὸς", fine speech, εὖ λόγος. They can also speak very devoutly, so that untrained Christians do not see thru their ignoble purpose & their error & are easily misled. The one sure means of guarding themselves against their harmful influence is therefore that one avoids & flies from them entirely. In the following statement, v. 19, where γὰρ extends over the whole many membered expression, the Apostle explains how he would that warn:

ing in v. 17. understood & why he had emphatically expressed it. He knows that the Roman Christians stand in obedience, their obedience to the Gospel has come to all, is known every where. Over that (he rejoices). Still he would also that they should be wise with regard to the good, to increase in the knowledge of the pure, salutary doctrine, on the other hand, they should be pure & simple, ἀκεκαίους, with regard to the evil, with all evil, thus also to remain untangled with false doctrine. False doctrine is an evil thing, yea, a work of the devil, satanic lies. The false teachers, who raise up discord & offense, are not servants of Christ, but stand in the service of Satan, who thru them would destroy faith & salvation in the Christians. Therefore the Apostle finally in v. 20 still points to this arch-enemy, but at the same time gives his brethren the assurance that God, who has received them into His peace, will not permit the devil to destroy his salutary work in them. Yea, in short, God will tread Satan under their feet. The day is not far, when the Lord shall crush Satan completely & shall deliver His own, from all evil from all the machinations of the evil foe. The expression ἐν τῷ πνεύματι - ἐν τῷ λόγῳ - πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους reminds one of Gen. 3, 15. The promise of the protoevangelion is certainly fulfilled objectively for all times thru the death of Christ on the cross, but it has its continual subjective realization within the congregation of Christ thru that victory of faith of the same over the devil, who has been judged & overcome by the redemptive death of Christ. Philippus And on that day will follow the decisive, final victory of the Seed of the woman, when He will repudiate & enclose the devil, the old serpent, in the abyss.

The wish of blessing, "Die Gnade unser Herrn Jesus sei mit euch" ("The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen"), we take as a conclusion to the additamentum, 16, 1-20.

V. 21-24. The Delivery of Greetings.

The foregoing Postscriptum, which had not now first come to the Apostle's mind, but which he had from the beginning, as Philippi remarks, reserved for the close of the Letter, he delivers to the Roman congregation the greetings of certain persons, who were at that time in his company. Above all from Timothy Timothy, his faithful co-worker, who was well known in all Christendom. The name of Timothy does not stand at the head of this Letter, as in other Pauline documents, which were sent to congregations in which he was known personally & to which he had rendered worthwhile service. The Roman congregation stood farther from him, & he also did not have, like Paul, the call to all the nations of the world. Still as the assistant of the Apostle to the Gentiles he self-evidently took a warm part in the happenings & successes of the evangelization in the capital city of the Roman Empire, & he attached this participation of his fellow thru his greeting. To Timothy are added three other fellow countrymen of Paul. The Jason named here is evidently identical with the Jason from Thessalonica mentioned in Acts 17, 5, and Sopater is really the same as Sopater from Berea, Acts 17, 10; and the assumption of Gaius does not lie so far that these two together

with the third, Lucius, were delegates of the Macedonian congregations in the matter of the collection & then accompanied Paul from Corinth to Jerusalem. Now Tertius, to whom Paul had dictated this Letter, avails himself of a word for his own person & writes: "Ich, Tertius, der diesen Brief geschrieben, grüesse euch in dem Herrn" ("I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord"), & thereby assures the Brethren in Rome, who have come very close to him in spirit by means of this Letter, that he knew himself to be bound very closely to them in Christ. Paul never dictates further: "Er grüesse euch Gajus, mein und der ganzen Kirche Gastfreund" ("Gaius mine host, & of the whole church, salutes you"). Under the hospitable roof of this Gaius, whom he himself had baptized, 1 Cor. 1:14, he had written this Letter. His house, however, stood open to all Christians, who had come to Corinth from distant places. With τῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως is hardly meant the local Corinthian congregation, since the expression ἐν ὅλῳ would not fit with that. Likewise Erastus, the city-receiver, the administrator of the city treasury in Corinth, sends his greetings. Vides, jam ab initio, quamquam paucos, aliquos tamen, fuisse Christianos in dignitate positos. Brother Quartus, a brother, was at all events also a member of the Corinthian congregation. The Christian brethren named in v. 21b and v. 23, who have borne greetings for the apostles to Rome, evidently had personal friends & acquaintances in the Roman congregation.

That Paul repeats his wish of blessing at the end of the Postscriptum, & certainly strengthens it by means of τῶν υἱῶν υἱῶν and ἀνιῶν, has nothing strange about it. The Roman Christians could perceive from that how open his heart stood toward them. Apostoli moritis fert, ut eandem salutandis formulam aliquoties repetat. Vide 11^a Thess. 3, 13 et 18. Ita hoc documentum, ubi epistola vale dicto consummata est, et alia paucis commemoranda menti se adhuc offerunt scribere volumus: vale dixerunt. W. H.

Vv. 25-27. A Blessing Doxology.

The words of vv. 25-27 in A B C D E, the most important versions, & in the Latin fathers stand at the close of the 16. chapter; on the other hand, in L, in most of the small letters, in the Greek fathers &lectionaries at the end of the 14. chapter. The most & the most important witnesses also speak for the fact that the placing of the doxology after 16, 24 is the original. In fact of 14, 21 it only destroys the close connection which exists between the 14. and 15. chapters. Certainly we cannot declare definitely why one has transposed it from the end of the 16. chapter to the end of the 14. chapter. What one has presented as an explanation for this like

the offense which many copyists are supposed to have taken in such a detailed closing doxology, or the reference of the τῶν υἱῶν υἱῶν ἀνιῶν ἡμῶν to the weak in faith or the lack of the two last chapters in Marcion or the very improbable circumstance, that in the reading of the Letter to the Romans in the Christian assemblies one had omitted the 15. and 16. chapters will not stand the test. On the other hand, it is explicable that in the uncertain position of this passage in the oldest records, some witnesses, like A P, have

to him it in both places, some, like F. G., have omitted it entirely. Closing doxologies are found also otherwise in apostolic documents, a shorter one, for example, in 11 Pet. 3, 18, a longer one which reads (very similar to ours here, in Jude 24, 25. That Paul does not otherwise conclude his Letters with a doxology of God is of no consequence. The Letter to the Romans is very unique in its nature. It corresponds only to the rich content of this Letter, that it comes to an end, as Meyer remarks, in "such an effusion of passion & fulness of thought." The Holy Spirit, who had spoken thru Paul here once again very strongly stirs his wings & lifts up the heart & mind of the writer of the Letter to God. After the Epistle in this Letter, as in no other, had presented the whole plan of salvation of God, he looks adoringly up to God, the originator of salvation, & in advance speaks praise & thanks to Him, because He has certainly carried out His work of salvation also in the Christian readers of this Letter. The closing doxology corresponds especially with the Introit of the Letter. *Extrema huius epistolae verba plane respondent primis, c. 1, 1-5, praevertim de Potentia Dei, Evangelio, Jesu Christo, scripturis, obedientiis, fidei, gentibus omnibus.* Bengel. With right the great majority of commentators, moved by outer & inner grounds, have held firmly to vv. 25-27 as the real closing, the proper conclusion of the Letter.

The doxology begins with the words: *τῷ θεῷ ὁ πανκράτει ὡς ἔστιν ἡ δόξα* v. 25a. The speech aims at ἡ δόξα. "Dem aber, der euch stärker kann" ("Now to him that is of power to establish you") - to Him be glory! With his intended visit in Rome Paul had aimed at strengthening the Roman Christians, *ὅς τὸ ἐστηρίξει ὑμᾶς, 1, 1.* That was also the purpose of this Letter. With God alone, however, is the power to strengthen, to establish, really: to place firmly, the Christians, so that they continue in their place. But to the divine object *τῷ θεῷ ὁ πανκράτει ὡς ἔστιν ἡ δόξα* there is now added a longer modifier by means of *κατὰ*. The connection of the two sentence parts we can first judge correctly, when we have examined the sentence structure dependent on *κατὰ*. It reads, first of all: "nach meinem Evangelium und der Predigt von Jesus Christo" ("according to my gospel & the preaching of Jesus Christ"), *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου καὶ τὸ ἐκπρεπὲς ἔργο τοῦ Χριστοῦ* v. 25b. As in the introduction of the Letter, 1, 1 ff., so also here at the close Paul refers again to his gospel, to the Gospel which had been entrusted to him by the Lord. According to its content that is nothing else than the preaching of Jesus Christ. Thus in 11 ff. it was called directly "das Evangelium von seinem Sohne ... Jesus Christo" ("the gospel of God concerning his Son, Jesus Christ"). The following words: *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μου* etc. are coordinated to the *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου*, and they contain a further description of the Gospel. The mystery mentioned here is according to the content the mystery concerning Christ & the salvation in Christ. That had been closed in times eternal, but has now been revealed, *τοῦ ἡρόντος ἀίνωτος ὁ ἀποκάλυψιν μου, πάντων ἡν ὁ θεὸς ἐκρύβεν* v. 25c. 26a. The *ἡρόντος ἀίνωτος* extend from eternity thru the course of the pre-Christian period of the world to the point of time designated by v. 26. Already in eternity God had formulated the counsel of the redemption of the human race thru Christ. It was at first hidden in God, Eph. 3, 9, and had remained closed also since

the beginning of the world & the time of the thousands of years from the childhood of men. Now, however, since Jesus Christ has come & God's council of salvation has been carried out, the secret of eternity has been manifested in that God has uncovered, revealed it to His holy apostles, $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, and they have proclaimed it to the world. Thus reads the continuation of the participial clause: $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\epsilon\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau'\ \epsilon\pi\iota\tau\chi\upsilon\gamma\eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \epsilon\theta\eta\zeta\ \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\omega\pi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \text{v. 26}$. The $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\omega\pi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ refers to the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ, which has now gone out & still goes out "unter alle Heiden hin," or, as we say, "unter allen Heiden" ("to all nations"). $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \epsilon\theta\eta\zeta\ \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\omega\pi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is a unified concept. Three modifiers are added to it. The proclamation of the Gospel is mediated "durch die prophetischen Schriften" ("by the scriptures of the prophets"), in that the apostles after the example of Christ joined or combined their teaching & preaching to the O. T. scriptures. The expression $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$ points back to the O. T. time & economy. God had noted His eternal plan of salvation thru His spirit already in the scriptures of the prophets. In the introduction it had been said that God had previously promised the Gospel of His Son thru His prophets in the Holy scriptures. 1, 2. Thus the children of the Old Covenant had already hoped in Christ beforehand. Nevertheless, even because the Saviour had not yet appeared,

(because the full understanding of the prophecy was lacking, & above all, because the knowledge of Christ was confined to a small circle & was still hidden from the world on the whole, the mystery of Christ could correctly be designated as a previously hidden mystery. Now, however, the apostles have brought the prophetic scriptures out of their relative obscurity, have brought the prophecy into the full light & not only attested & proven it only to Israel but also to all Gentiles, so that all prophecy is fulfilled in Christ. The proclamation of the Gospel has taken place & is taking place, as the apostle further calls to our attention, "nach Befehl der ewigen Gottes" ("according to the commandment of the everlasting God"). The eternal God, who disposes of time & eternity, has given this last time of the world to the preaching of Jesus Christ. He has given to the apostles, to the N. T. preachers, in general, the express mandate to make known the mystery of eternity to the nations of the earth. The preaching of the Gospel in the present era until the end of the world is the greatest & most important task. It certainly comes for the salvation of souls. The third modifier of $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$ gives the purpose of the proclamation of the Gospel. Thru the obedience of faith which alone justifies & makes man righteous before God, should be established among all nations. And now the reference of this entire description of the Gospel to the principle statement in v. 25a is evident. Accord-

(to this Gospel, or, to give the $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ more precisely, in consequence of ("zufolge") this Gospel God can & shall strengthen the Christians. The Gospel, which is ordained of God to bring to pass the obedience of faith, brings with itself that those who have come to faith also continue in the faith. The God who works faith thru the preaching of the Gospel can & shall also thru the preaching of the Gospel strengthen the believer in "true faith & preserve them to the end."

— We adopt as ours the words with which Labor has concluded the explanation of the Letter to the Romans: *Agostolicam* So *Godoyix ob gratiam, etiam in hac publicisque opera nobis praestitam, repentes in nomine Jesu auram hanc quistam ita dimimus: Sibi loquenti Deo per Jesum Christum, ipsi inquam* or rather *cuius gloriae recurre Amen.*

Finished: July 27, 1951